BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

DISSERTATION

THE CLAIMS OF THE CHRONICLER FOR THE ORIGIN OF THE ISRAELITE PRIESTHOOD

by

Gordon Lloyd Carr

(B.Th., Central Baptist Seminary, Toronto, 1953; A.B., Gordon College, 1964; B.D., Gordon Divinity School, 1965; Th.M., Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, 1966)

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

1972

Approved

by

First Reader . . James Frederick Leek . . .
Professor of Old Testament

Second Reader H. Neil Richardson . .
Professor of Old Testament

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages may have
indistinct print.
Filmed as received.

University Microfilms, A Xerox Education Company

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In any work such as this, an author draws on resources and individuals whose contributions are seldom noted in bibliographies and footnotes. Such is the situation here. I wish to take this opportunity to express my thanks formally to them.

Dr. Harrell F. Beck has been my major advisor in my doctoral program. His warmth and openness, his scholarly insights, and his genuine Christian friendship have guided me through many difficult areas. He has been a mainstay during my experience here. My second reader, Dr. H. Neil Richardson, has been a challenging and stimulating mentor whose concern for careful scholarship has done much to shape my thinking. To both of these gentlemen, much thanks.

I wish to thank Dean Richard Gross and the Faculty Senate of Gordon College for their concern that my responsibilities at Gordon College be kept at a manageable level so that this project could be pursued.

To Dr. William E. Zimpfer and the staff of the Boston University School of Theology Library I extend thanks for their willing assistance and for the many times they entertained and fulfilled my requests for strange and elusive materials.

The late Mr. C. Milburn Keen, Jr., and his successor,

Mr. John Beauregard, Director of the Library, Gordon College, have been most generous in their assistance, as have been Dr. Burton Goddard and the staff of the Goddard Library of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. Their help is much appreciated.

My typists, Mrs. H. K. Farrell and Mrs. W. G. MacDonald, have done yeoman service in the face of many revisions and ever-present deadlines.

Finally, to my wife Gwen and my son Randolph who have given up many hundreds of family hours so "Daddy can study," I owe more than I can express.

THE CLAIMS OF THE CHRONICLER
FOR THE ORIGIN OF THE
ISRAELITE PRIESTHOOD
(Order No.)

Gordon Lloyd Carr
Boston University Graduate School, 1972

Major Professor: Harrell F. Beck,
Professor of Old Testament

ABSTRACT

The problem of this dissertation is to examine the claims of the Chronicler that the post-exilic Israelite priesthood found its roots in the wilderness experience and was basically reorganized and restructured by David after the establishment of the monarchy. The problem is significant in light of the developing theology of priesthood in Israel after the Restoration. The issue is whether the evident differences in the Chronicler's account of the origin of the priesthood may be said to be legitimate on the basis of solid historical data within a surviving liturgical tradition or whether they are an innovative rewriting of the

older traditions in an effort to justify the practices current at the time of the Chronicler.

An examination of the Chronicles/Ezra/Nehemiah complex gives evidence that the Chronicler was a careful historian, conscientious, but selective in his use of his source materials. He had access to extensive collections of official documents, the writings of the prophets, and materials from the outlying towns as well as from Jerusalem. He cannot justly be accused of having wilfully distorted the Samuel/Kings accounts to substantiate his own theological perspective. Where there is enough evidence to provide a check, the Chronicler's story proves accurate, even in obscure details.

For the Chronicler, the unity of the Mosaic and Davidic covenants is a historical unity which can be traced back via the Levitical priesthood accurately and logically through David to Moses. The role of the Davidic line and the activity of the priestly/levitic groups are two elements which the Chronicler recognized as part of the same basic covenant of Yahweh with Israel.

The final linking of Davidic messianism with the priestly temple cultus was an innovative theological insight of the Chronicler from which has come much of the meaning and impact of the messianism of post-exilic Judaism and Christianity. There are hints of it in the Psalms and other pre-exilic literature, but it is really the Chronicler who

was the innovator of the point of view. Once he stated it, it was seen to have been already implied in the earlier literature. The central expectation of both Christianity and Judaism, as well as of many of the sects of the intertestamental period is that of the prophet/priest/king figure(s) who will restore the kingdom to the chosen people and bring in the messianic age.

The Chronicler built his theology with its profound new perspective, not on manufactured evidence, but on a view of the priesthood and its relation to the monarchy which fits into known practice in the ancient Near East at least as early as the middle of the second millennium B.C. and which is in keeping with the tenacious liturgical tradition which permeates the whole of the Old Testament.

In this light, the Chronicler's work deserves renewed study as it takes its place in the mainstream of the ongoing revelation of Yahweh's dealings with his people.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ABSTRACT

Chapter — Page

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation. 1
2. The Significance of the Problem. 1
3. The Limitations of the Dissertation. 2
4. Previous Research in the Field 3
5. The Method of the Dissertation 8

II. THE CHRONICLER AND HIS WORK

1. The Chronicler Himself 14
   i. His Identity 14
   ii. His Historical Situation 17
   iii. His Provenance 26
2. The Chronicler's Work. 27
   i. The Extent of the Chronicler's Work. . 27
   ii. The Purpose of the Chronicler's Work . 32
   iii. His Sources. 38
      (1) Official Records. 40
      (2) Official Genealogical Lists . . . 46
      (3) Prophetic Records 53
      (4) Other Official Documents. 72
      (5) Other Materials 81

III. OLD TESTAMENT TRADITIONS ON THE ORIGIN OF THE PRIESTHOOD

1. The Pentateuch 92
   i. Family Priests 93
   ii. Priestly Families. 97
      (1) The Levites 97
      (2) The Sons of Aaron 108
2. The Former Prophets. 110
   i. Non-Levitical Priests. 110
   ii. Micah's Levite 112
   iii. The Levites. 114
3. The Latter Prophets. 117
4. The Writings 121

IV. THE CONCEPT OF THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHRONICLER

1. The Orders of the Priesthood 124
   i. The Priests. 125
      (1) Priests 125
      (2) The Priest. 127
      (3) Sons of Aaron 133
      (4) The House of Zadok. 135
      (5) Levitical Priests 141
      (6) Other Priests 142

ii. The Levites. 143
(1) The Sons of Levi. 144
(a) Sons of Gershom. 146
(b) Sons of Kohath 147
(c) Sons of Merari 149
(2) The Guilds. 149
(a) Singers. 152
(b) Gatekeepers. 155
(c) Temple Servants. 158
2. The Origins of the Priesthood. 160
i. Mosaic 160
ii. Davidic. 162
V. THE CHRONICLER'S ROLE IN INTERPRETING THE ORIGIN OF THE PRIESTHOOD
1. The Chronicler as Repeater of the Traditions 169
2. The Chronicler as Innovator. 177
VI. CONCLUSIONS. 191
BIBLIOGRAPHY 195
VITA 218

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

1. The Problem of the Dissertation

The problem of this dissertation is to examine the claims of the Chronicler that the post-exilic Israelite priesthood found its roots in the wilderness experience and was basically reorganized and restructured by David after the establishment of the monarchy.

2. The Significance of the Problem

Pursuit of this problem is important for the light it may shed on the organization of the priestly office in the pre-exilic period, and for the evidence it may provide for a developing theology of priesthood in Israel into the post-exilic period. The changing political and religious situation to which the Chronicler was responding demanded a restatement (and a re-examination) of the foundations of the priesthood. In his time, the disappearance of both monarch and prophet placed a new and heavy burden of leadership on the restored priesthood. The issue is whether the evident differences in the Chronicler's account of the origin of the priesthood from those stated elsewhere may be said to be legitimate on the basis of solid historical data

within a surviving liturgical tradition or whether they are an innovative rewriting of the older traditions in an effort to justify the practices current at the time of the Chronicler. Further, the contribution which the Chronicler makes to the theory of the priesthood may prove to be his unique contribution to the theology of a covenant-related priesthood, providing the link between the pre-exilic cult and the cultic (Davidic) messianism that flourished in the diverging streams of Judaism and early Christianity.[1]

3. The Limitations of the Dissertation

The primary focus of attention in this dissertation will be on the books of I and II Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah. These four are a series of post-exilic books, usually attributed to the hand of the "Chronicler," and are generally considered to be a rewriting of the history of Judah from the time of David to the era of Ezra-Nehemiah. They follow the general pattern of the Deuteronomic history of Judah as found in Samuel and Kings, but with extensive omissions, additions, and differences. One of the key areas of difference

---

[1]Robert H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1941), p. 806, states, "The Chronicler is less single minded than Ezekiel or the author of the Priestly Code, who conceived the Jews merely as a church, a holy congregation, without much concern about political and national activities. For him the Jews are both a holy church (according to P) and a mighty nation of pure racial stock (as Nehemiah believed)--and this confusion between two quite distinct notions of Jewry has persisted from the time of the Chronicler to the present day."

is the account of the origin and history of the priests and Levites during the monarchy. This material on the origin of the priesthood will be the focal point of attention in this dissertation. However, for the sake of comparison, selected statements in the other Old Testament books on the origin of the priesthood will be examined. The functions and duties of the priesthood will be treated only as these relate to the concept of priestly origins in the various documents.

4. Previous Research in the Field

A very considerable revival of interest in the theology of the Old Testament since 1930 has resulted in an extensive bibliography which has tended to focus on the roles of the prophet and king, with much attention being given to the cultus generally and to the concept of covenant in Israel.

Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, long ignored by critical scholarship, are again beginning to be regarded as worthy of study. Recent commentaries include those by Galling and Rudolph in German, Cazelles and Michaeli in French, and Slotki and Myers in English.[1] There have been several

---

[1]Wilhelm Rudolph, Esra und Nehemia, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1949). Rudolph, Chronikbucher, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1955). K. Galling, Die Bucher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia, Das Alte Testament Deutsch XII (Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1954). H. Cazelles, Les Livres des Chroniques, La Sainte

essays and journal articles on the work and historicity of the Chronicler, most of them dealing with specific areas of the broad questions. These will be used where relevant, but they are not concerned with the specific topic of this dissertation.[1]

Extensive discussions of the function of the priesthood can be found in the standard works on the history and culture of the Israelites.[2] Most of these also treat the

---

Bible (Paris: Cerf, 1954). Frank Michaeli, Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie, Vol. XVI, Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament (Neuchâtel, Suisse: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1967). Judah J. Slotki, Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, Soncino Books of the Bible (London: Soncino Press, 1951). Slotki, Chronicles, Soncino Books of the Bible (London: Soncino Press, 1952). Jacob M. Myers, I Chronicles, Vol. XII, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1965). Myers, II Chronicles, Vol. XIII, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1965). Myers, Ezra-Nehemiah, Vol. XIV, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1965).

[1]See the Bibliography and the specific references in the body of this dissertation.

[2]For representative points of view, see Walther Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961), I, 392-432; Yehezkel Kaufmann, The Religion of Israel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960), pp. 175-200, 258-60, 301-11; Hans-Joachim Kraus, Worship in Israel (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1965), pp. 93-101, 179-238; Harold H. Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel (London: S.P.C.K., 1967); Gottlob Schrenk, "ειρευς, αρχειρευς," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. by Gerhard Kittel, trans. by Geoffrey Bromiley, III, 265-83 and the bibliography there; Roland de Vaux, Ancient Israel (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961), Part IV, especially pp. 345-405. Among the older works, Wolf Wilhelm Freidrich von Baudissin, Geschichte des altestamentliche Priesterthums (Leipzig, 1889); A. van Hoonacker, Le Sacerdoce lévitique dans la loi et dans l'histoire des Hébreux (Louvain: J. B. Istas, 1899); and G. Buchanan Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), pp. 179-270, are still extremely valuable.

problem of the origins of the priesthood in a summary fashion. The article by Liver[1] deals with the organization and claims of the Levites, but is oriented toward the accounts in Numbers.

Several recent dissertations bear on the issue. H. R. Weaver[2] covers the period of the Chronicler, stressing the development of the P code as it reflects the influence of the Persian society on the developing Judaism. He follows the common older view that P conserves the old faith but renovates it by putting new ideas into the Old Canaanite sacrificial system. R. W. Klein[3] focuses on the textual problems in the MT and the Greek versions, arguing for a fourth century date for the original work of the Chronicler but holding that the work has been dramatically modified by later writers. These modifications are reflected in the versions. F. H. Johnson[4] examines the parallel accounts in Chronicles and the rest of the Old Testament.

Of more particular importance for the present

---

[1]J. Liver, "Korah, Dathan, and Abiram," Scripta Hierosolymitana, VIII (1961), 189-217.

[2]Horace Robert Weaver, The Priesthood of Judaism in the Persian Period (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1949).

[3]Ralph Walter Klein, Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1964).

[4]Fred Heisse Johnson, Twice-told Tales: A Study of the Book of Chronicles and its Parallels in the Old Testament (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Drew University, 1947).

dissertation are the works of Lemke and Rehm.[1] Lemke's examination of the synoptic parallels is an attempt to ascertain the manner in which the Chronicler utilized his canonical sources. He distinguishes seven major themes which recur in the parallel accounts[2] but concludes that "for the purpose of getting at the Tendenz or theological intent of the Chronicler's history, a study of the synoptic portions is not really so informative as it is commonly held to be."[3] On this basis he observes that "the Chronicler has been too readily credited with free innovations when, in fact, he may only be following other sources which were available to him."[4] Lemke suggests that examination of the unique parts

---

[1]Werner E. Lemke, Studies in the History of the Chronicler (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1964), and Merlin Dale Rehm, Studies in the History of the Pre-exilic Levites (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1968).

[2]Lemke, Studies, p. 241. These are: (1) Israel was a theocracy, and the Chronicler attempts to spell out the meaning of the rule of God on earth as this involves the Davidic dynasty and the Jerusalem temple; (2) a "Pan-Israel Tendenz" in which all the people, not just the rulers, participate in the important occasions in the life of the nation; (3) an anti-north proclivity that is directed against the dynasty and cult rather than against the people of the north; (4) a doctrine of individual divine-earthly retribution that identifies mishaps as punishment from God for sin; (5) the idealization of pious kings by rewording the parallels or simply omitting all negative elements; (6) a temple-oriented cultic concern with the probability that the Chronicler was himself a member of one of the cult guilds; (7) a strong interest in the Levites.

[3]Lemke, Studies, p. 239.

[4]Lemke, Studies, p. 240. On the question of the sources, see below, Chapter II, pp. 38-90.

of Chronicles may provide a better illumination of his Tendenz, but he does not pursue that idea in his dissertation.

Rehm pays particular attention to the Levitic genealogies in the Old Testament. A careful text-critical and form analysis of the various materials relating to the question of the Levites is followed by an examination of the priestly terminologies. He does not deal specifically with Nehemiah or Ezra, but devotes twenty-five pages to Chronicles, particularly the genealogies. His work is very helpful, but in focusing so closely on the Levitic genealogies in the Old Testament he does not involve himself with the other material that illuminates the Chronicler's understanding of the priesthood. Rehm's work is essentially a treatment in depth of one aspect of the broader topic under discussion here.

The recent work by Aelred Cody[1] is a thorough examination of the history of the Old Testament priesthood and covers the broad scope of the historical development. It is a valuable study to which frequent reference will be made below, but it is not directly concerned with the specific emphasis which is the subject of this dissertation.

---

[1]Aelred Cody, A History of Old Testament Priesthood, Analecta Biblica, 35 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969).

5. The Method of the Dissertation

In view of the extensive earlier treatment it is legitimate to raise the question of the value of yet another attempt to study the origin of the Israelite priesthood and the work of the Chronicler. Rowley's assessment may be correct when he says that "the Chronicler . . . is generally agreed to be a better authority for the Temple arrangements of his own day than for those of the pre-exilic period."[1] However, the question of the possibility of a pre-exilic origin for much of the material relating to the post-exilic priesthood--a point of view advocated by such scholars as de Vaux, Albright, and Kaufmann--has re-opened the whole subject of liturgical practices and the antecedents of the post-exilic priesthood.

In the specific context of Chronicles study, the new theological perspective that increasingly is willing to allow that the Chronicler is a Midrashist[2] whose supplementing of the historical material of Samuel and Kings is a significant contribution to the understanding of the history of Israel, suggests that this study is valid. Further, the trend of the so-called Biblical Theology movement of the past two decades has been to recognize the validity of theological

---

[1] H. H. Rowley, Worship in Ancient Israel, p. 172.

[2] Jacob M. Myers, I Chron., p. xviii, attributes this title to I. Benzinger.

perspective in the treatment of the documents. This, coupled with the recent developments in the methodology of hermeneutic,[1] has provided a new framework within which new factual data as well as the long-known materials can be investigated.

In the fields of archeology and linguistic research the data are accumulating at a very rapid pace. New evidence in both of these areas has broadened contemporary understanding of the texts themselves and of their cultural milieu. Specifically, the growing evidence supporting the reliability and antiquity of liturgical traditions in general gives a valuable background for the tradition which the Chronicler reports. The whole area of study of oral tradition and cult-memory in Israel lends credence to this view. New data and new methodology, then, suggest that an opening up of these old questions is in order.

The history of the Israelite priesthood and the nature of the data in Chronicles is such that it is difficult to argue to firm conclusions. The Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah complex is difficult, confused, and at times imprecise, so that one needs to work through the primary sources and the secondary treatments in order to establish, as far as possible, one's own conclusions about these very imprecise data.

---

[1] Two collections which present various aspects of the recent discussion are Claus Westermann and James L. Mays, eds., Essays on Old Testament Hermeneutics (2nd ed.; Richmond: John Knox Press, 1964), and Bernhard W. Anderson, ed., The Old Testament and Christian Faith (New York: Harper & Row, 1963).

Much, at best, is based on inference from elusive texts, as is evidenced by the widely divergent conclusions various scholars reach. Hence detailed exegesis of the texts frequently does not clarify the issue one way or the other. Instead, a broad pattern of investigation into the methodology of the Chronicler and his sources provides a better clue to his overall perspective.

Accordingly, the first step in the methodology followed here is an examination of the Chronicler in relation to various theories of the geographic and chronological situation in which he worked. Some space is given to an examination of the Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah literary complex in order to define its limits and extent, and to discover the purpose for which the Chronicler was writing. Here, as in the previous section, there is a vast body of literature, so that it has been deemed wise to summarize and evaluate briefly the commonly held views. The balance of the second chapter is given to detailed examination of the sources used by the Chronicler and to ascertain, as far as possible, the reasons for his selection and use of his source material. This section is lengthy, and there are many tentative statements in it, but it seemed essential to work through that material carefully. What emerges is evidence of careful attention to detail and historical dependability on the part of the Chronicler.

The second major step is an examination of the

material in the other Old Testament documents on the origin of the priesthood. The Pentateuch has most of this from the earliest traditions of the head of the family acting as priest to the fully developed ritual of Leviticus. An important area of investigation here is the question of the origin and meaning of the term "Levite" and the relationship of the "Levites" to the "Sons of Aaron." In the Former Prophets there are a few key passages which merit consideration. The Latter Prophets and the rest of the Writings at best provide only indirect evidence for the origin of the priesthood.

The third major step in the treatment of the topic is to examine the portion of the Chronicler's work which deals with the origins and orders of the Israelite priesthood. Admittedly, there is considerable data in the Chronicler's writings that is unknown apart from his record. Hence the archeological and cultic data from non-biblical sources will be introduced at the appropriate places to illustrate that the kind of activity and organization the Chronicler attributed to the priesthood during the early monarchy was known to have been performed by organized priests at least that early. Much of the precise detail attributed by the Chronicler to David is, of course, beyond any formal verification outside the biblical text, but it will be argued that there is nothing intrinsically impossible about such an organization of cultic personnel at least as early as the late

second millennium B.C. The extensive material in the Chronicler on the duties of the various priestly orders will be incorporated only as it bears on the question of the orders and the origins of the priesthood. The chapter concludes with a statement on the two-fold origin of the priesthood as the Chronicler conceives it.

Chapter V consolidates the work of the preceding chapters by summarizing the points of similarity and difference present in the various accounts of the origin of the priesthood. Three perspectives emerge. Much of the Chronicler's picture of the origin of the priesthood is parallel to that of the rest of the Old Testament. Then there are those areas where the Chronicler synthesizes some of the strands of biblical tradition in an innovative way. It is here that the Chronicler's contribution to the developing theology of priesthood and covenant is most evident. The linking of Davidic messianism with the liturgical function of the priests and Levites represents a major theological breakthrough that should be credited to the Chronicler. Thirdly, specific attention will be given to the ramifications of the solutions offered to the problem that extensive material on the origin of the priesthood is unique to the Chronicler. This issue involves the question of the role of liturgical tradition in ancient Near Eastern society.

The final chapter contains a summary of the conclusions which may be drawn from the data of this dissertation.

These suggest that the Chronicler deserves renewed study as part of the growing body of material in Old Testament theology.

CHAPTER II

THE CHRONICLER AND HIS WORK

Of preliminary importance in an examination of the Chronicler's concept of the origin of the Israelite priesthood is an attempt to identify the man (or men) responsible for the material under discussion, to locate as far as possible his historical and geographic situation, and then to examine the work itself to determine its limits, the evident purposes for which it was written, and the sources which underlie the document as it now stands.

1. The Chronicler Himself

i. His Identity

For the most part, contemporary scholarship has rejected the idea that a given biblical book can be the work of a single individual. While there may be a basic core that derives from one author, the books as they now stand are generally considered to have been extensively supplemented and edited by a series of redactors over a long period of time. So it is with the books of Chronicles. The traditional Jewish identification of the "Chronicler" is that Ezra the Scribe was responsible for the combined books

of I and II Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.[1] Torrey refers to a very early tradition, dating from the second century B.C., that the Chronicler was none other than Nehemiah.[2] Even though the theory was apparently not long held, it is evidence for an editorial function connected with these books, performed in this view by Nehemiah.

There appears to be no other name traditionally attached to the "Chronicler." The general consensus is that if the Chronicler was not Ezra or Nehemiah, he (or they) was an unknown compiler/editor whose identity has long been

---

[1]Baba Bathra 15a. Note, however, that the Gemara assumes the "book" Ezra-Nehemiah to have been finished by "Nehemiah the son of Hachaliah."

[2]C. C. Torrey, The Chronicler's History of Israel (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954), p. xiii. He finds evidence for this in an apocryphal passage he dates B.C. 124. (The reference is 2 Macc. 2:13. "These things were narrated also in the archives or memoirs of Nehemiah; as well as how he founded a library and collected the books about the kings and prophets, and the books of David, and the letters of kings about sacred gifts.") Torrey's identification of this "library" with the Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah complex focuses on the body of material preserved only in these books: "1. matters pertaining to the kings (the bulk of the books of Chronicles); 2. the Prophets (eight writing prophets of Israel are made known only by the Chronicler); 3. the provisions made by David for the cult (the highly important chapters 1 Chron. 23-7, not found elsewhere); 4. the letters of royal benefactors (those of Cyrus, Darius, and Artaxerxes, preserved in Ezra). He is then represented as bringing the history down to his own day, in his narrative written in the first person." Torrey concludes, "This interesting passage illustrates and confirms the tradition. Our Chron.-Ezra-Neh. was at that early time recognized as substantially the work of one man (Nehemiah) who composed and published it as a continuous history." Torrey adds the following footnote. "The true meaning of this verse, identifying Nehemiah with the Chronicler, seems to have been generally unrecognized until recently. See JAOS. 70 (1950), 117f."

lost. Myers, appealing to both Albright and Torrey, states that

> on the basis of language, literary mannerism, and religious interests, the person who wrote the Ezra memoirs was responsible also for the Chronicler's work ...the author was one steeped in the history of Israel, a persistent student of her religious traditions, and a capable organizer...[but] the identity of the man...must, at present, remain an unproved surmise.[1]

On the contrary, Welch states that the "singularly independent attitude" the Chronicler adopts "makes it impossible to identify him with the author of Ezra,"[2] but that the adopting of the title "the Chronicler" does not really help. He further states,

> I venture a mild protest against the vague use of the title "The Chronicler." As one who has read a good deal of the literature on the Return, I have met the expression constantly but have never found it defined--with grave loss to clarity of understanding.[3]

Yet, in spite of this, the title will apparently have to do for the present. So, for the purposes of this dissertation, the title "The Chronicler" will be used to identify the first compiler/editor of the books of the Chronicles. Whoever he was,[4] his work is the core of the

---

[1]Jacob M. Myers, I Chronicles, Vol. XII, The Anchor Bible (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1965), p. lxxxvi.

[2]Adam C. Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism (Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1935), p. 218. See below, pp. 27-32, and cf. Sara Japhet, "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," VT, XVIII (1968), 330-71.

[3]Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism, p. 185, n. 1.

[4]Myers, Ezra-Nehemiah, p. lxviii, states that "after

books as we now have them. There is little doubt that this core was expanded, modified, edited, annotated and altered by those who followed him. The extent, precise detail, and specific areas so edited, are, of course, open to widely divergent opinion, depending partially on the date and geographic situation in which one places the Chronicler.[1]

ii. His Historical Situation

Compounding the problem of the identity of the Chronicler is the uncertainty surrounding the historical situation in which the book was written. Welch, in rejecting the identification of Ezra as the Chronicler, also rejects a post-exilic origin for the Chronicler. In his 1938 Schweich lectures[2] he argued that the "Chronicler" was a member of the faithful remnant that attempted to carry on the cultus in Jerusalem during the exilic period. This group, composed of remnants from both Judah and Israel, was served by both priests and Levites who re-established the unity of the cult at the God-chosen center, Jerusalem. "The Chronicler belonged to this little community and his book was written to

---

further study and the weighing of possibilities at hand, Ezra appears a more and more likely candidate for authorship." Cf. his remarks in I Chron. pp. lxxxvi-lxxxix.

[1]For further discussion of these, see below, pp. 19-27.

[2]Adam C. Welch, The Work of the Chronicler: Its Purpose and Date, The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1938 (London: Oxford University Press, 1939).

support their position."[1]

In his Post-Exilic Judaism,[2] Welch elaborates this thesis, concluding that the Chronicler did not even know the book of Ezra since he was writing prior to the temple restoration in 520-516 B.C. He was, therefore, an approximate contemporary of Ezekiel, and like the Prophet, his position on the cult was advanced as another solution to the vast problem of the continuity of the Jerusalem cult following the exile.[3]

If the traditional view that Ezra's journey to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 158. D. N. Freedman, "The Chronicler's Purpose," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIII (1961), 440, argues for a date ca. 515 B.C. for the Chronicler. He suggests that the Chronicler was strongly influenced by Haggai and Zechariah to declare Zerubbabel as the legitimate heir of David. Cf. W. E. Lemke, "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," Harvard Theological Review, LVIII (1965), 394.

[2] Welch, pp. 218-20.

[3] On pages 156-58, Welch places considerable emphasis on the similarities evident between Deuteronomy and Chronicles, and argues that these presuppose a situation in which the reform work of D was still remembered and before the time when the Priestly Code, under the restored priesthood, was the authoritative body of legislation. The position of Yehezkel Kaufmann in The Religion of Israel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960, pp. 153-211, that the Priestly document is "in every detail" pre-exilic (pp. 205-06), and in fact is very ancient, may undercut somewhat Welch's conclusions. If, in fact, "P crystallizes a stage of religious evolution earlier than D" (Kaufmann, p. 206), the similarities between Chronicles and D would not necessarily imply a pre-restoration date for Chronicles, but could merely indicate a preference for the D tradition on the part of the Chronicler. While this position has not yet been universally accepted in Old Testament scholarship, it is gaining some recognition.

Jerusalem in the seventh year of Artaxerxes[1] occurred during the reign of Artaxerxes I (465-424 B.C.) is valid, the earliest date possible for his work would be ca. 458 B.C.[2] Thus, any theory which associates Ezra with the Chronicler must include consideration of a mid-fifth century date and situation for the collection and editing of the material.

On the other hand, the obvious dependence of Ecclesiasticus 47:8-10 (180 B.C. or earlier) on I Chronicles

---

[1]Ezra 7:8.

[2]The question of the chronological and official relationships between Ezra and Nehemiah is one that in Rowley's words "has been a vexed one for the past half-century and more, and there is still no prospect of agreement amongst Old Testament scholars." (H. H. Rowley, "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament (2nd edition; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965. First published in Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume, Budapest, 1948, Part i, pp. 117-149), p. 137). Rowley follows Van Hoonacker's suggestion that Ezra was working under Artaxerxes II (404-359 B.C.), and that the return should be dated ca. 397 B.C. However, he summarizes the alternatives concisely in this article. The world of scholarly opinion is divided on this question. Hence there is no consensus. Even Albright has alternated between the positions, shifting his own idea at least four times (Rowley, p. 143). While the debate on this topic is extremely complex, and is important for a clear picture of the history of Israel, the influence of either date on the topic of this dissertation is really minimal. The span of fifty years is too brief to alter significantly the practical workings of the cult.

For further material on the question of the date of Ezra, see in addition to Rowley, op. cit., Otto Eissfeldt, The Old Testament: An Introduction (New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, 1965), pp. 531-56, who takes the late date. J. Stafford Wright, The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem (London: Tyndale Press, 1947) argues for the traditional date. John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminister Press, 1959), pp. 356-86, especially pp. 375-86, argues for a date ca. 428 B.C.

23-29,[1] the use of II Chronicles 2:2-15 by the Jewish historian Eupolemos about 157 B.C.,[2] and the discovery of fragments from Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah in Cave 4 at Qumran, make it highly improbable that any part of Chronicles can be dated as late as the Maccabean period.[3]

Practically, then, except for Welch's sixth century view, the outside limits for the work of the Chronicler are approximately 450 B.C. and 200 B.C.

Many scholars follow Driver and Pfeiffer and assign the book to the latter half of this span, during the Greek period. Driver argues that "a date shortly after 333 B.C. is the earliest to which the composition can be plausibly assigned."[4] Pfeiffer favors dating the Chronicler "about

---

[1]R. H. Pfeiffer, Introduction to the Old Testament (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1948), p. 811.

[2]Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 540.

[3]Myers, I Chron., p. 165. Frank M. Cross, Jr., The Ancient Library of Qumran (Revised ed.; Doubleday Anchor Books; New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1961), p. 41, notes the extremely small extent of the Chronicles material at Qumran. ". . . the single copy . . . is found on a three-inch strip of leather. Parts of six lines, two columns are preserved; but the worms have gorged themselves on Holy Writ. The result is a leather lace with only four complete words legible." Yet the affinities between this fragment and the 4QSam^{a} scroll and the text type underlying the LXX of Chronicles are such that Cross concludes that the Chronicler used an Old Palestinian recension of Samuel "not long after 400 B.C. in Palestine." (p. 189.) See below, pp. 44-46 for further discussion of this evidence on the question of the sources of the Chronicler.

[4]S. R. Driver, An Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament, the International Theological Library (9th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913), p. 518.

250 B.C. or a few years before . . . in the first part of the third century."[1] Much of the discussion centers around the genealogy of the descendants of Jeconiah in I Chronicles 3:17-24. The text, particularly verse twenty-one, is obscure, and may be interpreted to cover anywhere from five to eleven generations.

Jeconiah (Jehoiachin) was only eighteen years old when his abortive three-month reign ended in exile in Babylon.[2] Myers refers to one of the Weidner texts from "the thirteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar" (ca. 592 B.C.) which makes reference to the five sons of Jehoiachin as evidence that the oldest son was born not later than 597 B.C., that is, within the year of Jehoiachin's exile.[3] Albright's contention that the average generation in the royal and noble houses of the ancient Near East was between twenty and twenty-five years,[4]

---

[1]Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 812.

[2]I Chronicles 3:17 seems to imply that all children were born after the exile. This may be the explanation for the allowed survival of the royal seed.

[3]Myers, I Chron., p. 20, II Chron., p. 220. The reference here is to Mélanges Syriens offerts à M. René Dussaud, 1939, II, 923-28. On this basis, and assuming the same mother for the five born between 597 B.C. and 592 B.C., Pediah, the third son named, would have been born 595 B.C. or 594 B.C. W. F. Albright, "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel," BASOR, 100 (1945), p. 22, sets the date for the exile described in II Kings 24:8-15 as 598 B.C. Edwin R. Thiele, The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings (2nd ed.; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965), p. 283, sets the date at 597. The one-year difference is unimportant to the current discussion.

[4]W. F. Albright, "The Date and Personality of the

would set the maximum time span for an eleven generation line from Pediah to Anani at 275 years and the latest date possible no later than ca. 320 B.C. This material would seem to rule out Pfeiffer's date (at least for this portion of the material), but does fit within the scheme proposed by Driver. However, Driver arrives at the 333 B.C. date by taking the minimum number of generations (six) and allowing forty-five years per generation as his basis of calculation. He argues that eleven generations of forty-five years each would "not merely permit, but necessitate for the Chronicler" the later date.[1]

There is still the question as to the number of generations present here, but for the most part, Albright's six-generation position has carried the day.[2] If this is valid, then the date of this material is not later than the end of the fifth century B.C.[3] But this late a date requires that an average generation be thirty years, not the twenty to twenty-five years Albright has already argued for. If his twenty-five year maximum is correct, then the date falls

---

Chronicler," JBL, XL (1921), 110.

[1]Driver, Introduction, p. 518n.

[2]See his detailed defense of the position in the article in JBL, XL (1921), 104-24, especially pp. 108-12.

[3]Myers, I Chron., p. 21. Cf. Albright, JBL, XL (1921), p. 111, who sets the lowest limits for the birth of Elioenai's sons between 400-380 B.C., and the probable dates for these between 425 and 410 B.C.

almost precisely on the traditional Jewish date for Nehemiah's work, ca. 444 B.C.

A further complicating factor is the reference to the high-priestly line, particularly to Eliashib and Jaddua, in the book of Nehemiah. According to Neh. 3:1, 20, 21; 13:4, 7, 28, the high priest, at the time of Nehemiah's rebuilding, was Eliashib. On the other hand, Ezra 10:6 records that Ezra came into "the chamber of Jehohanan the son of Eliashib, where he spent the night." While the biblical text does not specify who the high priest was at that time, the Elephantine papyri speak of one Johanan as high priest in Jerusalem about 410 B.C.[1] It is argued that since Johanan and Jehohanan are forms of the same name, these references forbid dating Ezra as early as Eliashib.[2] As Rowley argues, Ezra would be more likely to spend the night in the chamber of the high priest than in the room of a lesser official, or even of a son or grandson of the ruling priest.[3] However, the combination of the evidence in Neh. 13:4-7, 28 and in the Elephantine papyri establishes the line of succession. Eliashib was high priest in 444 B.C. He was

---

[1]Cf. Neh. 12:23.

[2]See Rowley, Servant, pp. 153-59 and the sources cited in note 2, p. 19, for detailed examination of the various theories. Cf. also Laurence E. Browne, Early Judaism (Cambridge: University Press, 1929), especially pp. 164-80, and Albright, JBL, XL (1921), 112-13.

[3]Rowley, Servant, p. 155.

succeeded by his son Joiada (possibly ca. 432), and he, in turn, was succeeded by his son Johanan ca. 410 B.C.

The identification of this Joiada with Jaddua, who was high priest at the time of Alexander's conquest of Judah, has caused considerable historical and chronological confusion.[1]

The recent discoveries at Wadi Dâliyeh near Jericho have helped clear up some of the chronological problems of this period. Cross,[2] on the basis of some seal impressions and papyrus fragments which are clearly dated on internal evidence between 375 and 335 B.C., presents a strong case for a hereditary governorship in Samaria, and the establishment of a "Sanballatid" line extending over several generations with at least three governors taking the name Sanballat: Sanballat I (the Horonite) of Nehemiah's time; his grandson(?) Sanballat II, who ruled in the first half of the fourth century (the Sanballat of the Dâliyeh papyri); and Sanballat III, appointed by Darius III (335-330 B.C.), who, according to Josephus,[3] played an important role under Alexander the Great. Cross suggests that Josephus has a

---

[1]See e.g., Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 811 or Rowley, Servant, pp. 155-60.

[2]Frank Moore Cross, "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dâliyeh," New Directions in Biblical Archeology, ed. by David Noel Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1969), pp. 41-62.

[3]Antiquities, IX, vii, 6.

similar haplography in his lists of Zadokite high priests, so that, on the basis of this evidence from Dâliyeh, "it seems highly probable that we must insert a Johanan(?) and a Jaddua III in the series of high priests."[1] Thus it may be pushing the evidence too far to insist that these references to high priests forbid a date for Ezra (the Chronicler?) prior to the end of the fifth century B.C.

One other element needs to be considered in evaluating this material. The date of the canonization of the Pentateuch (including the P material) is normally set at about 400 B.C.[2] Eissfeldt suggests that since the Chronicler presupposes the completed Pentateuch to have been canonized already, his own work must have been done shortly after 398 B.C. It is apparent that the position taken on the P document is a deciding factor in the question of an earlier or later date for Chronicles. Pfeiffer goes so far as to declare that Albright's 400-350 date "is revolutionary in its implications,"[3] since it demands a publication date for the completed Pentateuch prior to 425 B.C.[4] Pfeiffer's reaction to this clearly reveals the presuppositions which frequently control his interpretation of the material. ". . . only

---

[1]Cross, "Dâliyeh," p. 57. His footnote to this passage indicates that Joiada is considered the first, on the basis of Lapp's "Ptolemaic Stamped Handles from Judah," BASOR, 172 (1963), 33, no. 54.

[2]Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 57. [3]Ibid., p. 811.

[4]Albright, JBL, XL (1921), 124.

scholars who reject the Wellhausen theory in toto could accept Albright's dating."[1] This may be somewhat overstated, for while Albright has drastically modified Wellhausen's theory, he has not totally abandoned it.

The situation can be summarized rather briefly. The evidence now points rather clearly to a date between 440 and 390 B.C. for the work of the Chronicler. Within that fifty year span various options are still open, but for the thesis set forth in this dissertation, there is no appreciable difference whether the Chronicler's work was done at the beginning, middle, or end of that period of fifty years.

iii. His Provenance

The question of the provenance of the Chronicler is closely linked with the question of his historical situation, but on this point there is little disagreement. Although it is evident that he has a basic concern for the position of the Levites who had been the priests of the northern sanctuaries prior to the secession of Jeroboam,[2] the obvious concern he displays for the Jerusalem cult and the ancient Davidic kingdom demand a Judean milieu for his work. Welch's observation that the post-exilic hope was for a

---

[1] Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 812.

[2] Cf. e.g., Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 790, 796.

united nation[1] worshipping with a united priesthood and a single temple has met with little disagreement.[2] Thus, whether the Chronicler is a native Jerusalemite or a "returned" exile who had been born in Babylon, his true home is Judah, specifically Jerusalem.

2. The Chronicler's Work

i. The Extent of the Chronicler's Work

As noted above, there is considerable disagreement as to how much of the Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah complex is the work of a single author and how much has been added later. Myers states,

> Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are so closely related in thought, language, and theology that not only must they have come from a single hand, with possibly a few exceptions, but, like the other great literature of Israel, this author must have had in view a purpose that the earlier histories of his people did not meet in the form in which they had been transmitted.[3]

The view that these books are really a single composition has long been held. Driver's detailed treatment of the

---

[1]Welch, Work, p. 158.

[2]The question of the final schism between the Jews and Samaritans is one which has attracted much attention. Rowley, in his article "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple," BJRL, XXXVIII (1955), 184f, gives detailed bibliography on the various views. However, the Dâliyeh papyri seem to sustain Albright's position in From the Stone Age to Christianity (2nd ed., Anchor Books; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, 1957), p. 346n. He sets the date for the founding of the Gerizim temple early in the first century B.C.

[3]Myers, I Chron., p. xviii.

Chronicler's peculiar style of expression and grammatical construction[1] was supported by Torrey in his 1896 monograph.[2]

[1]Driver, Introduction, pp. 505-08, and 535-40.

[2]Charles C. Torrey, The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah, Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft II (Geissen: J. Richer'sche Buchhandlung, 1896). Torrey's evaluation of this has some interesting sidelights. Commenting on the sources of Ezra 7-10 and Neh. 8-10, he argues for the unity of these chapters with Ezra 1-6, stating that "it is the Chronicler [his italics] and he alone whose work can be discerned here." (Comp., p. 15). The evidence he presents is based on vocabulary, mode of expression, ideas, and syntactical peculiarities. These similarities are so close as to exclude "the supposition of two writers moving in the same circle of ideas, or representing the same stage in the history of the language" (p. 16). Then he proceeds to comment on the style itself: "awkward repetition; . . . just what we should expect from him [the Chronicler] . . . slovenly style . . . clumsy way of using proper names . . . labored accumulation of substantives and clauses, . . . the awkward suspended construction. . . . Such matters as logical and grammatical connection were evidently of no concern to the writer . . . it might be possible, it would not be easy, to find a portion of Chronicles of equal extent written more abominably than Neh. 7, 70-9, 5; 10, 1-40. If there is a valid argument from language, style, and recurrence of characteristic ideas, we have an example of this kind before us" (pp. 27-28). Nehemiah 1-7 (except 3:1-32), and Ezra 4:9-6:14 (except 4:9b, 10, 24; 6:9, 10), are the only parts of these two books which Torrey says were not written by the Chronicler but were found in his source material (pp. 35, 49-50). This tends to downgrade the historical accuracy of the Chronicler and to destroy the validity of the story of the restoration of the Law in Judea after the exile (pp. 57-65), or even the return from exile itself. Cf. Torrey, The Chronicler's History of Israel, pp. xxvii-xxviii where he states that "The entire picture of the Return from the Babylonian exile is absurd and impossible throughout, unworthy of any serious attention. . . . There is no mention of the great Return. Why not? Because there was no return" [his italics]. But, in spite of the absurdity of his thesis, Torrey has made a major contribution to Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah studies by his presentation of the evidence for the essential unity of the three books. The most recent work on the opposite side of this question is the extensive article by Sara Japhet, VT, XVIII (1968), 330-71. Her

Then in his 1954 treatment of the problem of the Chronicler's history Torrey states,

> It is well known that Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah originally constituted a single work. It was in form a history, beginning with Adam and ending with the reforms of Nehemiah. The Old Hebrew tradition states this clearly, and modern study has confirmed the report.[1]

Welch, on the other hand, limits the work of the Chronicler to I Chron. 10:1-II Chron. 36:21, excluding the table of genealogies in I Chron. 1-9, the closing verses of

---

conclusion, that the Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah complex was neither written nor compiled by the same author or editor, is based on her observation that there are differences between Chron. and Ezra-Neh. in the use of specific technical terms (nine items), in linguistic/grammatical areas (formation of the imperfect consecutive, the lengthened imperfect consecutive, and theophoric names), and on peculiarities of style in both bodies of material (thirteen in Chron. and eight in Ezra-Neh.). Yet, if the Chronicler is careful in his use of source material (see below, pp. 38-90), the evidence gathered by Miss Japhet need not be construed as she concludes.

[1]Torrey, History, p. ix. Cf. also, Charles C. Torrey, Ezra Studies (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910), pp. 208-47. Torrey here rejects the possibility of the Chronicler being Ezra. Albright, in JBL, XL (1921), 119-21, on the same evidence, arrived at the conclusion that the Chronicler was Ezra. R. K. Harrison, Introduction to the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1969), p. 1157, declares that "attempts to identify the Chronicler with Ezra appear inadvisable because of significant differences in style, historical and theological perspective, the treatment of source material and the basic metaphysic of history exhibited in the two compositions." Harrison further raises the possibility that the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are to be seen as a series of supplementary books, arguing "if these three works constituted a unity from the beginning and bore the imprimatur of Ezra upon them, it would be far from easy to see precisely how or why they became separated in the first place." (p. 1169). Further, the order of the events described in the books is chronological, while the apparent order of canonization of the three is the reverse. These are serious questions

II Chron. 36, all of Ezra, all of Nehemiah, and what he calls "alien elements"[1] in the main body of the work.[2] Although he disagrees with the source-critical methods of Rothstein and Hänel,[3] he gives these authors credit for having "clearly proved that Chronicles is not derived from one hand, but has been subjected to a very thorough revision."[4] His own conclusion is that there is a basic pro-David narrative which originates in the exilic period. This account has, in many sections, been carefully revised and annotated in accord with a different perspective on the temple, the ark, and the role of the Levites and priests[5] by an annotator who "belonged to the generation which followed the return from the Exile."[6]

---

that demand investigation in a broad study of the whole historical problem, but which do not impinge directly upon the topic of this dissertation.

[1]Welch, Work, p. 1.

[2]Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism, pp. 185ff.

[3]J. W. Rothstein and J. Hänel, Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik, Kommentar zum Alten Testament (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1927).

[4]Welch, Work, p. 5.

[5]Ibid., pp. 149-55. The ramifications of this two-source theory for the "Chronicler's" concept of the origin of the priesthood will be considered below, pp. 177-190.

[6]Ibid., p. 155. Freedman, CBQ, XXIII (1961), 441, argues for a date ca. 515 for the Chronicler, with chapters 1-9 and Ezra-Nehemiah added in the last half of the fifth century "to bring the earlier work up to date and to adapt it to the changed circumstances of the fifth century community."

This two-strand theory has had considerable support, but has not been universally followed. Noth's work on the problem[1] suggested a series of redactors rather than a "second Chronicler."[2] Eissfeldt summarizes the problem when he writes, "Whether these expansions are . . . to be ascribed . . . to one elaborator . . . or are to be assigned to several hands can hardly be decided definitely."[3]

It is evident that there is considerable latitude in the precise limits assigned to the work of the Chronicler. However, there is now fairly common agreement that his work includes at least the bulk of I and II Chronicles, except possibly the extensive genealogical lists in I Chron. 1-9 and 23-27.[4] This writer's opinion is that Myers and Johnson appear to have the best case. Therefore, for the purposes of

---

[1]Martin Noth, Uberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, I, (Tübingin: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1943. 2nd ed., unchanged, 1957), pp. 110-80.

[2]Eissfeldt credits this phrase to Galling. Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 535, 540.

[3]Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 540. He marks I Chron. 1-9 and 23-27 as particularly evident additions to the Chronicler's work.

[4]Marshall D. Johnson, The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies, Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph series (ed. by Matthew Black; Cambridge: University Press, 1969), pp. 44-55 presents extensive arguments pro and con on including these passages in the Chronicler's work. He concludes (p. 55), "The weight of the evidence puts the burden of proof on those who would consider the entire genealogical introduction to Chronicles as later additions. But what is more, the evidence renders the attempts to minimize the Chronicler's hand in this material difficult and tenuous."

this dissertation, a working assumption will be that the books of Chronicles and Ezra show sufficient similarity in thought, style, purpose, and theological perspective to be considered essentially the product of one hand, and that the book of Nehemiah, if not by the same person, is by one who was closely associated with him. Thus the main focus of attention will be on the books of Chronicles, with supportive data from Exra and Nehemiah.

ii. The Purpose of the Chronicler's Work

That the Chronicler had a theological purpose behind his writing is universally acknowledged. That purpose guided the selection of his materials and the structure of his work. But it is not valid to go beyond the evidence of the documents themselves in the search for that purpose. Lemke warns that the interpreter must avoid the all too common solution of attributing every deviation of the Chronicler from his known sources to some tendentious theological perspective.[1] On this cautionary note, the examination of the

---

[1]Lemke, "Synoptic Problem," HTR (1965), 361. He quotes, approvingly, Albright's critique of "judgment about personal reactions." William Foxwell Albright, History, Archeology and Christian Humanism (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 26. "Many historians are exceedingly careless about attributing to their characters all sorts of personal and psychological reasons for acting in situations where there is no evidence to show what motives or emotions may have operated. Where an historical figure describes his own motives, which are then corroborated by more than one friend and accepted by more than one enemy, we may have good reason for taking him at his word, but such agreement is extremely rare in modern times and is virtually

Chronicler's purpose proceeds.

Welch indicates that two main questions are implicit in this investigation: 1. What reason prompted the Chronicler to duplicate the history of the kingdom? 2. Why did this account receive so much attention from revisers?[1] Of these the first is far more important since recent study tends to see much larger amounts of the material as coming from the hand of the Chronicler.

There is general agreement that the Chronicler's basic purpose was to present the history of the nation from the perspective of the Davidic kingdom and the cultic practices being carried on in the post-exilic period. For

---

unobtainable in dealing with antiquity. . . . In dealing with Biblical characters, such judgments ought to be omitted entirely in serious historical writing." Albright goes on to say, "The historian must be careful not to abstain from such judgments where they are needed," but he must be careful to recognize these as subjective judgments which therefore "cannot yield any appreciable quantity of historical data and . . . can rarely be controlled by experimental psychology--the only kind which possesses any scientific verifiability." (p. 27). Lemke's thesis here also downplays the extensive article by Brunet. Adrien-M. Brunet, "Le Chroniste et ses Sources," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 481-508; LXI (1954), 349-86. On pp. 350-51, Lemke dismisses some of Brunet's examples of "theologically motivated" changes as "needless hairsplitting," particularly in the light of the new textual evidence discussed below, pp. 44-46. Brunet, however, is firm in his conclusion that "le Chroniste est habituellement fidèle à ses sources bibliques. Cette fidélité va quelquefois jusqu'à la minutie," even though "il se permet parfois de manifester une grande liberté à leur égard." Brunet, p. 385. It is this conclusion which Lemke finds somewhat overdone.

[1]Welch, Work, p. 6.

example, Rudolph states that the purpose of the whole work, including Ezra and Nehemiah, is "to present the realisation of the theocracy in Israel,"[1] that is, according to Abijah in II Chron. 13, the narrowing focus of election and the selection of the Davidic dynasty and the centrality of the Jerusalem temple cult.

Welch[2] has essentially the same view, but with added stress on the idea that the glory of the Davidic line was that it stood for a united nation because it was reigning under divine authority. He notes that the limits of Chronicles--from the capture of Jerusalem by David to the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar--indicates that the center of interest was the dynasty and the temple.[3]

Von Rad states that the main concern of the Chronicler's history is to "legitimate the cultic restoration in the post-exilic period on the basis of a legacy of David's which had not been brought into effect until this time."[4]

Curtis stresses the Priestly orientation of the Chronicler and his rewriting of the earlier history "as it

---

[1]Wilhelm Rudolph, "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 404.

[2]Welch, Work, pp. 19-23, 153-55, and Post-Exilic Judaism, pp. 188-207.

[3]Welch, Post-Exilic Judaism, p. 188. In Work, pp. 153-54, he attributes the link with Moses as the work of the reviser, not the Chronicler.

[4]Von Rad, Old Testament Theology, I, p. 127.

should have been had the priestly legislation originated with Moses and been upheld and carried forward by the pious David and his godly successors. To remedy this defect was clearly the object of the Chronicler."[1]

Pfeiffer sees the Chronicler as a late third century apologist for Judaism rather than as an historian.[2]

> Against the claims of the Samaritans, who possessed the Law of Moses and a rival temple at Mount Gerizim, against the pretensions of the Gentiles of Europe and Asia, the Chronicler set out to prove that the religion of that infinitesimal community was the only true one and that the temple was the religious center of mankind, the sole earthly abode of the only God in existence.[3]

Similarly, Eissfeldt comments,

> The aim of the whole work is, however, to prove that in contrast with the godless northern kingdom, it is only the southern kingdom of Judah, with its Davidic dynasty and its Jerusalem Temple which is the true Israel, the legitimate bearer of the divine rule which is actualised in the kingdom of David, and that it is only the community of the Jews who returned from

---

[1]Curtis, ICC, p. 9. See also pp. 6-15.

[2]Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 806, states, "It is an error to consider the Chronicler as a writer of history. It is futile to inquire seriously into the reality of any story or incident not taken bodily from Samuel or Kings. His own contribution should be classed, with the books of Jonah, Esther, Tobit, Judith and the like, as historical fiction."

[3]Pfeiffer, Ibid., continues, ". . . the validity of such grandiose pretensions could never have been established by means of a sober assembling of the facts of past or contemporary history. No rational proof of the truth of such faith can ever be given. Of necessity and through his natural inclination, the Chronicler was led to fabricate wonderful evidence to prove his case. Like all later apologists, he gave two arguments for the validity of his religion: its extraordinary antiquity and marvelous achievements." See below, pp. 177-190.

> Exile, and not the religious community of the Samaritans, which was in the process of coming into being at the time of the Chronicler, which faithfully maintains and continues this tradition.[1]

He might have added that the Jews who had remained in Jerusalem were on the fringes of the chosen group.

Browne follows in a similar vein. The Chronicler's history "gave the place of first importance to the Jewish people and the Jewish religion and regarded Jerusalem and its temple as the pivot of the world."[2] Thus the Chronicler is anti-diaspora as well as anti-Samaritan.

Young rejects the suggestion that the Chronicler fabricated the material, but he does acknowledge,

> It is perfectly true that the writer had a religious aim. The exiles had now returned from Babylon, and through his work the writer sought to show them the true glory of their nation as the theocracy and to show them the rights and importance of the Davidic dynasty.[3]

Harrison sees the Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah complex as a unit. "Whereas Ezra and Nehemiah supplied the contemporary historical background, Chronicles was written to furnish the pre-exilic religious and historical foundation of the theocracy."[4]

Finally Myers states that the purpose of the

---

[1]Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 531.

[2]Browne, Early Judaism, p. 27.

[3]Young, Introduction, p. 425.

[4]Harrison, Introduction, p. 1169.

Chronicler is "to present the history of Israel (Judah) from a cultic point of view showing how the nation prospered when the cultus was maintained in purity and vitality, and how it fared when that was not the case."[1]

As noted above, there are obvious differences between the Chronicler's history and those of early writers, but as Welch points out, "want of interest in a subject, not difference of view, may well have prompted an old-world historian to curtail his predecessor's narrative."[2] He continues that in this editorial work on the sources, the "changes and additions invariably tend to bring out that the rule of the Davidic house over a united Israel was based on the divine purpose."[3]

Albright narrows the focus somewhat with his comment that "Ezra was not interested in historical researches, but only in ecclesiastical succession (i.e., priestly and related genealogies) and theological orthodoxies. . . ."[4] A national political and cultic unity is the basis of the

---

[1]Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. lii. On p. lxx n. he elaborates somewhat. "The impression created by a rapid reading of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, at one sitting, is that the writer or compiler was really offering an apologia pro Jerusalem and its now continuing worship, his intention being to demonstrate that there could be no rapprochement with the syncretistic cults to which Sanballat and Tobiah adhered, while making, at the same time, a subtle appeal to them to accept the true faith of the fathers."

[2]Welch, PEJ, p. 187. [3]Ibid., p. 192.

[4]Albright, JBL (1921), p. 123.

Chronicler's account.

> His ideal was an Israel which owed its existence to its religion and which found its center in the two installations of the kingdom and the temple at Jerusalem. Both of these came into existence when the nation reached consciousness of its unity after the confusion of the conquest; but both ultimately derived from God who, having elected Israel, had revealed the institutions which were to guide its outward and inward life.[1]

There is obviously a theological purpose behind the work of the Chronicler. The prominent role assigned in the documents to David and his descendants is clear. Less obvious, but certainly present, is the awareness that there is a recognition of the older Mosaic cult in the Chronicler's work.[2] He wants to present the unity of these two covenantal traditions in terms of the close ties between the royal and cultic offices, and to this end, he works with his sources.

iii. His Sources

An examination of the texts of Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah indicates that two broad types of material are present. There are large blocks which are assigned to specific sources, and other blocks which appear to be original with the Chronicler.[3] According to Pfeiffer, these latter

---

[1]Welch, PEJ, p. 217.

[2]See below, pp. 133-135, 160-162, 169-171, 188-190.

[3]Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 531-38. For a full treatment of the questions of the sources, see Martin Noth, Uberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien, I:110ff, and the extensive article by Brunet in Revue Biblique (1953-54). Cf. von Rad, O.T. Theol., I:348.

constitute about one half of the material, and show "no dependence whatsoever on extant earlier literature."[1]

Myers groups the sources into five general categories:[2] 1. Official records, e.g., possibly the royal archives or other records on the activities of the various kings. 2. Official genealogical lists, e.g., possibly the early lists from the Pentateuch.[3] 3. Prophetic records, including both excerpts from the canonical writing prophets and materials attributed to other prophets and seers of Israel. 4. Other official documents, including royal letters, government directives, and memoirs of public officials. 5. Other materials derived from the written records of the people.

There is considerable discussion of the question of the extent to which these "sources" had already been anthologized by the time the Chronicler used them, and how much of the basic work with the sources was done by him in

---

[1]Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 803.

[2]Myers, I Chron., pp. xlv-xlviii.

[3]Young, Introduction, p. 415, suggests that for the early genealogies in I Chron. 1-9, "the writer made use of old statistical lists which had survived the downfall of Jerusalem and the exile." This is an attractive theory which would help explain the differences between the Chronicler's genealogies and those preserved in the Pentateuch, but there is no objective evidence to sustain the thesis that such records did, in fact, survive the chaos of 597-536 B.C., unless the village lists (see below, pp. 50-52) mentioned in I Chron. 9:22 are these.

the course of his writing.[1] An examination of Myers' broad classifications will set the question in sharper focus.[2]

1. Official Records--The bulk of this material is similar to the canonical books of the Deuteronomistic History, I Samuel through II Kings, but to account for the evident differences between Samuel-Kings and Chronicles, various reasons have been advanced.

Pfeiffer's position is that the Chronicler "often quoted verbatim" but "never hesitated to modify the narratives of Samuel and Kings whenever it suited his purpose." He

> modified the canonical sources through suppression, addition, expansion, and change . . . to remove from the story whatever was inconsistent with his religious views . . . or his fanciful notion of historical fact. . . . He deals with Samuel and Kings arbitrarily, rewriting whatever suits his purpose with complete freedom and no scruples about historical accuracy or verisimilitude.[3]

---

[1]Myers, I Chron., p. xxiv.

[2]For the Ezra-Nehemiah material Myers employs four divisions but with many primary sources within these. (Myers, Ezra-Neh., pp. xlviii-lii). 1. The pre-Ezra-Nehemiah period (Ezra 1-4), which is a collection of official Persian and Hebrew letters and lists concerning the return and the rebuilding of the temple. 2. The Memoirs of Ezra, containing letters, prayers, official documents, lists, etc., from Ezra. 3. The Memoirs of Nehemiah which contain the same sort of material as the Ezra Memoirs, but in a different stylistic form. 4. Other materials in Nehemiah, consisting of ceremonial records, prayers and lists of persons and places. These are sources of the same character as those of Chronicles, and can be treated in the same way as those others. Cf. Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 542.

[3]Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 802-03. Gerhard von Rad, O.T. Theology, Vol. I, p. 348, expresses a similar

Eissfeldt, on the other hand, states that "the Chronicler follows in general" the Samuel-Kings account, but is highly selective in his choice of matter, omitting most of the references to the northern kingdom and some of the episodes in the lives of the southern kings that show these in a less than favorable situation.[1] However, both Eissfeldt and Young[2] suggest that rather than re-writing Samuel-Kings, the Chronicler actually wrote a new book, drawing in part on the same sources as the author of Samuel-Kings had used, with each author selecting from the common sources the material which best sustained his own point of view.

This seems to be a valid conclusion. Where the Chronicler discusses the reigns and activities of Jothan (II Chron. 27:7), Josiah (II Chron. 35:27), and Jehoiakim

---

though less critical view. "Its literary basis is made up of the Deuteronomistic historical work, but over and above this the author worked up the historical picture from a copious body of edifying narrative material which is for the most part of very late date. But he regularly interfered with his originals and sources, sometimes by omissions or slight insertions, sometimes by revision or rearranging the sequence of events in a much more arbitrary way than the Deuteronomist did--the latter as a rule handed on the older material intact." Cf. Noth, Uberlief. Stud., I, pp. 110ff., and Driver, Introduction, pp. 527-35.

[1] Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 532.

[2] Ibid., and Young, Introduction, p. 416. Young obviously rejects Eissfeldt's suggestion that the Chronicler had a partisan motive for such selectivity, although he does argue for different points of view for the Chronicler and the author of Samuel-Kings. Driver, Introduction, pp. 527n, 528-32, rejects this possibility completely.

(II Chron. 36:8), he refers to "the Book of the Kings of Israel and Judah." Where he recounts the stories of Asa (II Chron. 16:11), Amaziah (II Chron. 25:26), Ahaz (II Chron. 28:26), and Hezekiah (II Chron. 32:32), he refers to "The Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel."[1] The acts of Jehoshaphat (II Chron. 20:34) are recorded in the "Book of the Kings of Israel." And the acts of Manasseh are in the "Chronicle of the kings of Israel" (II Chron. 33:18).[2] For the author of the book of Kings, all of these are to be found in "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah."[3]

---

[1] II Chron. 32:32 gives some hint of the nature of this book, noting that it contains "the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz." Note also II Chron. 20:34, "The chronicles of Jehu the son of Hanani which are recorded in the book of the kings of Israel." See below, pp. 53-72.

[2] II Chron. 33:19 also mentions the "Chronicles of the Seers." This is also apparently an official document, but is not to be identified with the "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel."

[3] Following the same order of kings used above the references are to Jotham, II Kings 15:36; Josiah, II Kings 23:28; Jehoiakim, II Kings 24:5, Asa, I Kings 15:23; Amaziah, II Kings 14:18; Ahaz, II Kings 16:19; Hezekiah, II Kings 20:20; Jehoshaphat, I Kings 22:45; and Manasseh, II Kings 21:17. The author of Kings also has three other references to this book: II Kings 8:23, Joram; II Kings 12:19, Joash; and II Kings 21:25, Amon. The Chronicler omits any references to sources of additional information on Joram (II Chron. 21) and Amon (II Chron. 33), probably because of the negative attitude he reveals toward these kings, even though he does record unfavorable comments about other kings. He does refer to the "Commentary [מדרש] on the Book of Kings" (II Chron. 24:27) for further detail on the career of Joash. In addition, Kings refers to "the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" eighteen times, recounting the activities of the rulers of the northern kingdom (I Kings 14:19; 15:31; 16:5, 14, 20, 27; 22:39; II Kings 1:18; 10:34; 13:8, 12; 14:15, 28; 15:11, 15, 21, 26, 31).

This identification supports Eissfeldt's conclusion that "in spite of the differences in the titles it is quite certain that the same work is mentioned in all five cases."[1]

A single reference to the "Chronicles of King David" (I Chron. 27:24) in the middle of a census list suggests that this sort of record was an integral part of the royal archives and that these were preserved for long periods of time.[2] The reference in II Chron. 35:4 to "the directions [כדב] of David king of Israel and the directions of Solomon his son" may apply to the same "book," or to an entirely different body of material. In either case, both David and Solomon are specified as the authors of certain cultic and legal materials.[3]

Extensive parallel passages are included in the Deuteronomic history and in Chronicles, but there are also areas where considerable additional information is presented in the Chronicler's account. It has been the fashion to attribute these to the Chronicler's inventive imagination or propagandistic spirit that was concerned only to reinforce

---

[1]Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 533. He includes the "Midrash" in II Chron. 24:27 noted above.

[2]There has been little discussion on the value of this text as source material. Myers, I Chron., p. xlvi, mentions it, but does not elaborate. Driver, Introduction, p. 187, says that in this text "it is implied that the results of David's census would in the ordinary course of things have been included in the 'chronicles' of his reign," that is in the official political records of the years of his rule.

[3]See below, Chapter IV and pp. 183-190.

his theological perspective.[1]

The problem is compounded by the divergent textual witnesses covering these books. As Lemke points out, it has been generally taken for granted that

> the text of the Chronicler's canonical Vorlage was virtually identical with our present Masoretic Text. As a result, commentators have been quick to credit the Chronicler with many tendentious or theologically motivated deviations, wherever the two histories diverge from one another.[2]

However, as is well known, the LXX of Samuel-Kings differs markedly from the MT of those books and frequently the MT of Chronicles follows the LXX of Samuel-Kings more closely than it follows the MT.[3]

It has become apparent during the last twenty years that there was a series of developing textual traditions among the Jews in the centuries following the Exile.[4] Specifically, the Qumran manuscripts have "established once for all that in the historical books the Septuagint translators faithfully, and with extreme literalness reproduced their

---

[1]Driver, Introduction, p. 533; Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 789.

[2]Werner E. Lemke, HTR, LVIII (1965), 349-50.

[3]Cf. e.g., Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 180-81, and Browne, Early Judaism, pp. 27-35. Browne's view on the translation of I Esdras from a different Hebrew and Aramaic original of Chronicles-Nehemiah follows this presupposition.

[4]Frank Moore Cross, "Qumran and the Biblical Text," Israel Exploration Journal, XVI (1966), 93.

Hebrew Vorlage."[1] This evidence is of vital importance in the matter of the Chronicler's sources, for it is now obvious, according to Cross, that the Chronicler "utilized the prevailing Palestinian text."[2] This text type, used by the LXX for Samuel, is "the text type current in Palestine at the end of the fifth century B.C."[3] The two major Samuel manuscripts from Qumran sustain this view.[4] This "Old Palestinian Recension"[5] is reflected in both 4QSam^{a} and Chronicles. "In passages where Samuel and Chronicles overlap, this manuscript often preserves a text much closer to the text of Samuel used by the author of Chronicles than to the

---

[1]Cross, Ancient Library, pp. 180-81. His footnote continues: ". . . save for a very few poetic passages (e.g., the Song of Hannah), . . . paraphrasing is virtually absent from the Septuagint of Samuel and no evidence is to be found of conscious changes made by the translator on theological or otherwise tendentious ground."

[2]Cross, "Qumran," IEJ, 88. See this article and Lemke, HTR for further references.

[3]Cross, Ancient Library, p. 189.

[4]Cross, "Qumran," IEJ, 83 dates 4QSam^{a} to 50-25 B.C., and in his article "The Oldest Manuscript from Qumran," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 152, he dates 4QSam^{b} to the end of the third century B.C. He remarks in Ancient Library, p. 179n24 that 4QSam^{b} "often preserves a text superior to both the Septuagint and Hebrew textus receptus." Cody, p. 74n34, credits the work of B. Johnson, Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta (Studia Theologica Lundensia, XXII; Lund; 1963), with confirming that the LXX^{B} text of I Sam. is "the purest representation of the old pre-hexaplar LXX."

[5]Cross, Ancient Library, p. 188.

traditional text of Samuel surviving from the Middle Ages."[1] In fact, Cross argues, "toward 400 B.C. . . . the Chronicler used the Old Palestinian text current in Jerusalem in his day."[2] More precisely, "in 1 Sam. 1-2 Sam. 11:1 the Chronicler used a text very closely related to that of 4Q Sam^{a} and LXX^{BL} and in 2 Sam. 11:2-24:25 a text closely related to 4Q Sam^{a} and LXX^{L}, but not to LXX^{B}."[3] He concludes from this that "the usual picture painted of the Chronicler violently or willfully distorting Samuel and Kings to suit his fancy must be radically revised."[4]

It appears more and more likely, therefore, that the Chronicler had access to legitimate and dependable sources in the official archives, and that the differences between his account and that of the author of Samuel-Kings in these areas may be attributed in part to ancient text-types rather than to imaginative invention on the part of the Chronicler.

2. Official Genealogical Lists--One feature of the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 41. On pp. 188-89 he lists some of the evidence and examples. In his article in JBL (1955), 171-72, he treats in detail the material in 4QSam^{b}, noting in summary that 4Q agrees with the LXX against the MT 13 times and with MT against LXX only four times.

[2] Frank Moore Cross, "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," Harvard Theological Review, LVII (1964), 294.

[3] Ibid., pp. 294-95.

[4] Ibid., p. 294 n. 41. See also Lemke, HTR (1965), 350-60 for a dozen examples sustaining this position.

Chronicles-Ezra-Nehemiah complex that has attracted considerable attention is the large number of genealogical lists the Chronicler uses as evidence to establish or sustain a tradition that links his contemporaries with the founders of the nation.[1]

The patriarchal lists in I Chron. 1 parallel very closely the lists in Genesis, except for some abbreviations and some spelling variants. In I Chron. 2:1-8, he draws on Hexateuchal material but with much simplification and many changes in order. Beginning in I Chron. 2:9 and continuing to the end of chapter nine, there is a combination of materials drawn from the Deuteronomistic history and a large

---

[1] As was indicated above, pp. 27-32, much of this genealogical material is often considered to be a later addition to the Chronicler's work. However, Myers' observation that the content of these lists supports the Chronicler's aim of validating the Davidic claims for priority in the history of the nation and of the cult is well taken (cf. e.g., Myers, I Chron., pp. 6, 13, 19, etc.), and tends to lend weight to his view that for the most part, these genealogical lists should be included as part of the Chronicler's work.

The Ezra-Nehemiah lists are not concerned so much with the pre-exilic history, but focus primarily on those who had taken part in the events of the return and the rebuilding. Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. xlix, notes the following: Ezra 2:1-70, a list of those who returned with Zerubbabel; 7:1-14, a list of the heads of families who returned with Ezra; 10:18-44, a list of those who had foreign wives; Neh. 3:1-32, a list of builders; 7:6-72, a census list; 10:1-28, those who were signatories to the agreement; 11:3-24, a list of the residents of Jerusalem; and 12:1-26, a list of priests and Levites.

K. A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and Old Testament (London: Tyndale Press, 1966), p. 55, emphasizes the fact that in all of the Ancient Near East genealogical lists were selective, and that it is this principle of selectivity rather than some factual error which needs to be given primary consideration in evaluating these lists.

amount of new material unparalleled elsewhere.[1]

Both Torrey and Pfeiffer, followed by many others, suggest that these genealogies are "artificial concoctions designed to relate theocratic institutions to a Davidic, if not actually to a Mosaic origin."[2] Pfeiffer's own words are

> Whenever we can test the Chronicler's genealogies with authentic ancient documents we discover that in correcting them he wilfully sacrificed historical facts on the altar of doctrinal and ecclesiastical presuppositions. This is true of all his work.[3]

Myers, however, suggests that much of this material was not of the Chronicler's invention, but was drawn from authentic temple archives.[4] For instance, the Calebite genealogy (I Chron. 2:42-50), contains much pre-exilic information drawn probably from a military reserve list that had been prepared during the reign of David or Solomon.[5]

The Simeon genealogy in I Chron. 4:24-43, for example, includes the family list, the list of cities,[6] and a

---

[1]Cf. Myers, I Chron., pp. 1-liii, for details.

[2]Harrison, Introduction, p. 1166. See also Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 799f, and Torrey, Ezra Studies, pp. 227ff.

[3]Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 799.

[4]Myers, I Chron., p. lxiii.

[5]Ibid., p. 16. He attributes this idea to Noth, ZDPV, LV (1932).

[6]The statement in v. 31, "these were their cities until David became king," is taken by Myers, I Chron., p. 31, and Aharoni, IEJ, VIII (1958), 31, as clear evidence that the Chronicler has here drawn on an ancient and trustworthy source. The force of this text seems to have been largely overlooked by other writers.

resumé of the movements of the clans and their leaders.[1] Myers indicates, on the basis of work by Albright and Aharoni, that of the four Simeon lists in the Old Testament, the Chronicler's is the one which "transmits the names in the most accurate form."[2]

The references to the genealogies of Simeon (I Chron. 4:33), Benjamin (I Chron. 7:9), Gad (I Chron. 5:17), and Asher (I Chron. 7:40), are indicative that the lists presented by the Chronicler are not to be considered in isolation, but as supplementary to other known records. This is hardly the kind of reference an author would make if his own material was pure fiction and contrary to existing material.

Three other references give an indication of the official nature of these genealogical lists. I Chron. 9:1 indicates that the "Book of the Kings of Israel" discussed above,[3] was composed, in part, from these family records. II Chron. 12:15 indicates that the official archives of the reign of Rehoboam are to be found in the "records of Shemiah the prophet and Iddo the seer; so also is the official

---

[1] Myers, I Chron., p. 30.

[2] Ibid., p. 31. His references here are to Albright, JPOS, V (1925), 149-61 and Aharoni, IEJ, VIII (1958), 26-38. Driver, Introduction, p. 527, says regarding these lists, "It seems that the returned exiles felt an interest in reviving as far as possible the old status quo of the community, and with this end in view paid careful attention to such genealogical records as existed and took steps to complete and restore them."

[3] See above, pp. 41-43.

genealogy."[1] Both of these texts are evidence for the existence of official genealogical lists as part of the state papers.

The mention of the genealogical lists in the villages (I Chron. 9:22), while used specifically of the gatekeepers, implies that these were recorded in the local village census lists rather than (or in addition to) some central tribal or national office. If these men are in fact "Levites," there is an indication here that the individual Levites were reckoned as citizens of towns and villages, and could be identified geographically as well as gentilicly.

This may lend support to the suggestion of Harrison[2] (rejecting the accusation of Pfeiffer), that the Chronicler arbitrarily

> transforms the Ephraimite (I Sam. 1:1) Samuel (I 6:22-28, 33-38 [MT 6:7-13, 18-23]), and the Gittite (I 13:13; II Sam. 6:10f) Obed-edom (I 16:38; 26:1-8; cf. 15:18, 21, 24; 16:5) into genuine Levites, serenely unaware of the contradiction between I 13:13; 15:25 and I 15:18, 21, 24.[3]

At first glance it appears as if Samuel is an Ephraimite (I Sam. 1:1), and that Pfeiffer's accusation against the Chronicler is valid. But a closer examination yields at least one other possibility. The text can legitimately be

---

[1]Myers, II Chron., p. 73. The RSV relegates this last clause to a marginal reading. See below, pp. 71-72.

[2]Harrison, Introduction, p. 1166.

[3]Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 799-800.

understood to mean that Elkanah, Samuel's father, was not necessarily an Ephraimite by tribal descent, but rather was a resident of Ramah, of the district of Zuph, in the tribal territory of Ephraim.[1] He was therefore reckoned as under the civil jurisdiction of the Ephraimites, even though he was, according to the Chronicler, a Levite by tribal affiliation.[2]

Similarly, Harrison, elaborating a suggestion by Young,[3] points out that Pfeiffer has assumed that the name Obed-edom applies only to one individual whereas the texts indicate that at least two men bore that name: (a) the gatekeeper (I Chron. 15:18, 24) for the ark, and (b) a member of the musicians' guild (I Chron. 15:21). He further notes that in I Chron. 16:38 these two are clearly distinguished.[4]

---

[1]Harrison, p. 1166. Cf. E. Kautzsch, and A. E. Cowley (eds.), Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, corrected ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1960), s. 125h, and Emil G. Kraeling, Rand McNally Bible Atlas (New York: Rand McNally & Company, 1956), p. 172.

[2]If the Chronicler had access to I Sam. in his researches, he apparently did not interpret בן-צוף as other than a proper name of one of the ancestors of Elkanah (cf. I Chron. 6:26, 35), in spite of the problem this posed in the harmonization of his sources. It is possible he simply assumed the title "Ephraimite" to have applied in the geographic rather than the gentilic sense here as it obviously does in the first half of the verse. Whatever the explanation, his inclusion of "Zuph" in I Chron. 6:26, 35 indicates a concern to reproduce his sources closely, not a desire to ride roughshod over the evidence in order to prove a point.

[3]Young, Introduction, pp. 423f.

[4]Harrison, p. 1166 suggests that there may be some textual corruption here, so that "the explanatory gloss 'the

Pfeiffer's comment that "Obed-edom is . . . a Philistine captain of David hailing from Gath"[1] goes beyond the evidence. The man is apparently on friendly terms with David, for he allows his home to be requisitioned as a lay-over place for the ark, but there is no evidence that he was either a member of David's army or even that he was a native of the Philistine city of Gath where David had spent part of his exile.[2] Rather, if this Obed-edom is a "Levite" it is because he is also a "Gittite," that is enrolled in the city of Gath-rimmon, the Levitical city of refuge in the Danite territory (Josh. 21:24). He was not "made" a Levite by the Chronicler's imagination.

While this argument from the "village lists" is not conclusive, it is supportive of the Chronicler's integrity, and helps clear him of the charge of totally arbitrary emendation of his sources, particularly of his genealogical structures.

A minor point which may also give evidence of variant sources carefully preserved is the stylistic change from

---

son of Jeduthun' should follow the first Obed-edom rather than the second, the reference to his 'sixty-eight brethren' being obviously to his musical companions." This "corruption" in no way affects the point Harrison is making--that there are obviously two Obed-edoms, both active in temple service at the same time.

[1]Pfeiffer, Introduction, p. 800. Cf. I Chron. 13:13; II Sam. 6:10-11.

[2]I Sam. 21:10-15; 27:2-7; 29.

"son of . . ." in I Chron. 6:1-13 to "his son" in vv. 16-30.[1]

Harrison concludes,

> From the above comments it will appear evident that a proper reading of the Levitical genealogies in Chronicles shows that the lists are far from fictitious in character.[2]

And Eissfeldt remarks that in these lists, "there is . . . concealed valuable ancient material."[3] This judgment seems to stand, so that the genealogical lists can themselves give evidence of having been derived from carefully guarded and transmitted sources.

3. Prophetic Records--Myers calls the third group of source materials used by the Chronicler the Prophetic Records. Three categories are represented here: (a) references to known materials in the books of the canonical prophets, (b) references to prophets who are known from the historical books but who have left no collections of their prophetic oracles apart from those recorded in the history, (c) references to prophets who are unknown except for the Chronicler's records.

Of the first group, whether or not there is sufficient evidence to sustain Eissfeldt's statement that "the

---

[1]Care needs to be taken in this kind of distinction to avoid the extremes to which some have carried the idea of "stylistic criteria" in determining various sources.

[2]Harrison, Introduction, pp. 1166f.

[3]Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 535. He lists here a number of journal articles dealing with these materials.

Chronicler knew the prophetic books from Isaiah to Malachi" is debatable.[1] But it is evident that the Chronicler did know at least some of the canonical prophetic books. In Ezra 5:1 and 6:14 he refers to the prophetic work of Haggai and Zechariah and their part in rebuilding the temple. But he appears to be limited to the canonical books here.[2]

---

[1]Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 534. He continues, "The quotation from Isa. vii, 9 in II xx, 20 and from Zech. iv, 10 in II vi, 9 prove this without a doubt." The Chronicler has king Jehoshaphat (r. 873-849 B.C., Albright, BASOR, 100, p. 20) using words similar to those Isaiah used against Ahaz ca. 730 B.C. But where Jehoshaphat's statement is positive, Isaiah's is negative. II Chron. 20:20 reads "believe in the Lord your God and you will be established; believe his prophet and you will succeed." הַאֲמִינוּ בַּיהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם וְתֵאָמֵנוּ הַאֲמִינוּ בִנְבִיאָיו וְהַצְלִיחוּ Isa. 7:9 reads "if you will not believe, surely you shall not be established." אִם לֹא תַאֲמִינוּ כִּי לֹא תֵאָמֵנוּ Eissfeldt may be assuming too much when he credits the Chronicler with "quoting" Isaiah. This logion may be simply a traditional Wise Saying that was common in Israel from early times, preserved one way in Isaiah and the other in the source used by the Chronicler.

Eissfeldt's second reference (Zech. 4:10; II Chron. 6:9) apparently is an error. Both texts are concerned with the temple, but there is no evidence of identification. II Chron. deals with the Solomonic temple while Zech. is referring to the second temple. (II Chron. 6:8-9. "But the Lord said to David my father, 'Whereas it was in your heart to build a house for my name, you did well that it was in your heart; nevertheless you shall not build the house, but your son who shall be born to you shall build the house for my name.'" Zech. 4:9-10, "The hands of Zerubbabel have laid the foundation of this house; his hands shall also complete it. Then you will know that the Lord of hosts has sent me to you. For whosoever has despised the day of small things shall rejoice, and shall see the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel.") An examination of the context of Eissfeldt's remark has failed to turn up any clarifying comment.

[2]Browne, Early Judaism, p. 41, points out that the Chronicler has Zechariah as a descendant of Iddo (not 'son' but grandson, according to Zech. 1:1), but does not have a lineage for Haggai, since Haggai's prophecy contains no reference to his family.

Further, as was noted above,[1] the acts of Hezekiah are said to be recorded "in the vision of Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, in the Book of the Kings of Judah and Israel" (II Chron. 32:32). The suggestion was made that the royal archives were made up, in part, of the writings of the prophets. However another possibility emerges here regarding the nature of these records. Chapters 36-39 are a close parallel to II Kings 18:13-20:19 with the addition of Hezekiah's song of thanksgiving in Isa. 38:9-20. It may be only this section to which the Chronicler is referring for material on Hezekiah's reign, but this identification does not satisfy the brief reference to the "acts of Uzziah" which Isaiah is reported to have written (II Chron. 26:22). Slotki notes that the only reference to Uzziah in Isaiah is in 6:1, and that, therefore, II Chron. 26:22 "suggests that the prophet wrote a history of the reign which has not been preserved."[2] He further argues[3] that in II Chron. 32:32 the preposition in the construction עַל סֵפֶר מַלְכֵי-יְהוּדָה should be rendered "beside, in addition" rather than simply "upon." This, along with the absence of the ו "and" indicates that there was another book besides the "Book of the Kings of Judah." Slotki identifies this other book with the "vision

---

[1] See above, pp. 41-43.

[2] I. W. Slotki, Chronicles, The Soncino Books of the Bible, ed. by A. Cohen (London: Soncino Press, 1952), p. 287.

[3] Ibid., p. 320-21 n.

(prophecies) of Isaiah" (i.e., the canonical book, especially chapters 36-39), but in the light of his comment on 26:22 it seems equally plausible that there was a totally different book which, though not now preserved, was known to the Chronicler.

There is a considerable body of material in II Chron. 26 relating to an aggressive agricultural and military policy of Uzziah which has no parallel in Kings, but which has been supported by recent archeological discoveries.[1] While it is impossible to prove that this material in II Chron. 26 was derived from a source that was Isaiah's writing, this is at least a possibility.[2]

The only other canonical writing prophet mentioned in Chronicles is Jeremiah. It is worth noting that the Kings account omits any reference to this prophet, in spite of the high regard in which the Deuteronomist held Josiah.[3]

---

[1]See Myers, II Chron., pp. 151-54 for details and bibliography.

[2]The careful note in II Chron. 26:23 that Uzziah "was interred in the field beside the cemetery of the kings" (Myers' translation, II Chron., p. 154), rather than in the royal tombs is taken by Myers to indicate a careful concern for accuracy, based on factual materials. Cf. also Slotki, Chron., p. 287.

[3]J. G. S. S. Thomson, "Jeremiah," The New Bible Dictionary (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1965), pp. 610-11, suggests that Jeremiah "recognized that Josiah's reforms were in reality a retrograde movement because they threatened to undo the work of the prophets. Reformation in worship without reformation of heart was useless." Linked with this was Jeremiah's repudiation of the Deuteronomistic claims of perpetual validity for the central shrine at

It is only in II Chron. 35:25 that mention is made of the nation, mourning and the leading role Jeremiah played in it.[1]

In II Chron. 36:12, the Chronicler adds a note to the Kings account of the downfall of Zedekiah, attributing it not to his execution of the policies of Jehoiakim, but specifically of rejecting the word of Yahweh through his prophet Jeremiah, and rebelling against Nebuchadnezzar.[2]

In the parallel accounts in II Chron. 36:21-22 and Ezra 1:1 there is further recognition of Jeremiah's prophetic word of judgment and cleansing in preparation for the promised return.[3]

Three references to "Moses the man of God" [אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים] (I Chron. 23:14; II Chron. 30:16; Ezra 3:2), fit

---

Jerusalem, and for the right of the Davidic dynasty to rule in perpetuity. If this is the case, it would be natural to assume the Chronicler would also ignore Jeremiah. Yet this most priestly oriented, Davidic apologist is careful to treat his sources accurately and to give the prophet his due.

[1]The "lamentations" written in eulogy of Josiah apparently formed part of a large collection of which the canonical Book of Lamentations may also have been a part. (See Myers, II Chron., p. 216). Myers suggests that "according to I Esdras i 33 it was preserved in the official history of the kings of Judah," (Ibid.), but an examination of that text reveals only a close paraphrase of II Chron. 35:23-27 rather than another collection. Slotki, p. 340, records that the Targum interpreted Zech. 12:11 in this context, and that Jeremiah's prophecy in Jer. 22:10 is also a probable reference to this event.

[2]Slotki, Chronicles, p. 344. Cf. Jer. 21:1ff; 37:3ff; 38:17ff.

[3]Cf. Jer. 25:11; 29:10.

this category. This title is probably intended to identify Moses in the prophetic office.[1] These three texts deal with the Levitical standing of Moses' sons, and Moses' involvement in establishing the cultic orders. The reference in Ezra 3:2 makes specific point of the cultic orders "written in the law of Moses, the man of God." Thus there is the implication that, for the Chronicler, Moses the prophet was the source of certain cultic procedures which had been preserved in written form.

The second group of prophets mentioned by the Chronicler is made up of prophets known from other Old Testament books but who were not "writing prophets." The Chronicler names nine such persons.

Two of the group--Samuel and Elijah--are among the best known figures of the Old Testament. The references to Samuel are straightforward, posing no serious problems except the question of the Levitical genealogy of Samuel and his sons.[2] In I Chron. 9:22 Samuel is described as the "seer" who, with David, was responsible for establishing the role of the Korahites as gatekeepers in the temple, and in I Chron. 26:28, he is included among those who dedicated gifts for the maintenance of the house of Yahweh. This

---

[1]On the use of this title "Man of God" of the prophetic office, see Rolf Rendtorff, "נָבִיא in the Old Testament," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, VI:809. See below, pp. 69-71.

[2]See above, pp. 50-51, on I Chron. 6:28.

latter appears to be an anachronism, but may simply refer to the gifts given to support the organized cult and the local cultic centers rather than just the unbuilt temple.[1]

The mention of Samuel in II Chron. 35:18 in the context of the Josianic reform[2] also bears the marks of careful use of source material. There is similarity with II Kings 23:22, but in Chronicles the substitution of "Samuel the prophet" for "the judges that judged Israel" suggests that

---

[1]Myers, I Chron., p. 178 says, "The reference to the contributions of Samuel, Saul, Abner, and Joab certainly does not sound like the Chronicler, who had nothing good to say about Saul. On the other hand, it may actually carry further one of his fundamental conceptions which is expressed in the constantly recurring phrase 'all Israel,' or 'all the congregation of Israel.' If that is really the case, this addition serves to strengthen that principle by emphasizing the combined contributions of seers, kings, and generals toward the central religious institutions of the nation." There is no parallel to this section in the Kings account. Myers' explanation, while it has much to recommend it, does not explain why the Chronicler would invent such a story about these men. There were other "seers, kings, and generals" who were much more highly regarded than these four, and who had guided the centralization of the cult. The fact that the Chronicler does acknowledge the contributions of these four (even though they come under the care of a Davidic appointee), suggests that the Chronicler was conscientious in his use of his source material, even when his purpose may have been better served by an excision of this section.

[2]The text reads, "No passover like it had been kept in Israel since the days of Samuel the prophet; none of the kings of Israel had kept such a passover as was kept by Josiah, and the priests and the Levites, and all Judah and Israel who were present, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem." The suggestion of Myers, II Chron., p. 213, that passover celebrations as national rather than as family rituals are premonarchial is well taken, but it does not necessarily follow from that that there was no continuation of official celebration during the monarchy. The Chronicler is stressing the widespread participation rather than just the official nature of the event.

this aspect of the cult had not been conscientiously followed at any time during the monarchy. This is a strange admission, unless it is based on fact, for one who was so cult-oriented as the Chronicler, and so concerned to establish the strong cultic ties with the Davidic dynasty.

The other two references to Samuel are in the context of his official relationship with David. In I Chron. 11:3, the Chronicler adds, beyond the record in II Sam. 5:3, that David was made king over Israel "according to the word of the Lord by the hand of Samuel." The identification of Samuel as "prophet" is not made here, but he functions as a prophet in that he is the vehicle of the word of Yahweh.[1] In I Chron. 29:29 Samuel, Nathan, and Gad are identified as court historians, commissioned to keep detailed and accurate record of the affairs of the nation and king.[2]

---

[1]Cf. Rendtorff, TDNT, VI: 801.

[2]The conjunction of names and descriptive nouns is instructive. Samuel is הָרֹאֶה; Nathan is הַנָּבִיא; and Gad is הַחֹזֶה. As is well known, I Sam. 9:9 indicates that רֹאֶה is the older designation of the office of נָבִיא. Rendtorff, TDNT, VI:809f, indicates that חֹזֶה seems to be the title of an office in the royal court. (Wilhelm Michaelis, "ὁράω," TDNT, V:329 states that "חֹזֶה as a title, refers usually to a professional seer in the service of a king.") Such a conclusion seems valid in this context, although there is no indication that such a royal appointment guaranteed favorable words for the king from the seer. Such an expectation is present in Amaziah (Amos 7:12), but Amos rejects this concept and emphasizes the role of חֹזֶה and נָבִיא as one and the same, putting the חֹזֶה above partisan politics and leaving him primarily responsible to Yahweh and his law rather than to the person of the king. See also, in this regard, the chapter in Welch, Work, pp. 42-51, on the relationship between the Chronicler and prophecy.

The single reference to Elijah (II Chron. 21:12), poses a bit of a problem. The text quotes a letter from Elijah to Jehoram of Judah.[1] If the record in II Kings 1-8 is in approximately chronological order, Elijah lived to see his pronouncement of doom on Ahaziah of Israel fulfilled,[2] and the throne of Israel occupied by Ahaziah's brother Jehoram (II Kings 1:17).[3] The translation of Elijah is recorded in II Kings 2, some time during the reign of Jehoram of Israel.[4] The pronouncement against Jehoram of Judah for having "walked in the ways of the kings of Israel" and leading "Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem into unfaithfulness" (II Chron. 21:13), comes to Jehoram of Judah by letter, apparently no later than 845-844 B.C.[5]

---

[1]Reigned 849-842 B.C. (Albright, BASOR, 100, p. 21).

[2]R. 850-849 B.C. (Albright, BASOR, 100, p. 21).

[3]R. 849-842 B.C. (Ibid.)

[4]Edwin Lewis Curtis, and Albert Alonzo Madsen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles, The International Critical Commentary (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1910), p. 416, that II Kings 3:11ff indicates that Elijah "clearly was not living at this time" does not demand the translation of Elijah "before Jehoram came to the throne" (so Slotki, Chron., p. 257). The rebellion of Moab (II Kings 3:5) following the death of Ahab was no short-lived episode. Since it was "King Jehoram" (v. 6), who finally put down the Moabites, the rebellion must have lasted longer than the "two years" Ahaziah ruled Israel. How much longer is a moot question. Several months would be the minimal time necessary for the new king to consolidate his power over Israel and enter into an alliance with Jehoshaphat.

[5]II Chron. 21:19: ". . . at the end of two years . . . he died in great agony."

The easiest solution to the problem is that suggested by Francisco.[1] He argues that II Kings 3:11f does not state, but merely implies, that Elijah was dead. Elijah may have been alive, but occupied elsewhere, so that only Elisha was available for consultation in the crisis. Of course this explanation is possible, but it assumes that I Kings 1-8 is not in chronological order. Rudolph's comment on II Chron. 21:12 that the text reads "a letter came from Elijah" rather than "Elijah sent a letter" may suggest that the wording implies Elijah was already dead.[2]

Several other possible explanations have been offered, none of which is really satisfactory. Traditionally, Jewish commentators have held that, "Elijah, from heaven, influenced a contemporary prophet to write down his message and communicate it to the king."[3] Rudolph notes, however, that the idea of a message from the other world was too far advanced for the Old Testament period to which this was attributed.[4] Rudolph likewise argues that the suggestion that the name should read Elisha rather than Elijah, a suggestion

---

[1]Clyde T. Francisco, "1-2 Chronicles," I Samuel-Nehemiah, Vol. 3. The Broadman Bible Commentary (Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1970), p. 393.

[2]Wilhelm Rudolph, Chronichbücher, Handbuch zum Alten Testament (Tübingen: Mohr, 1955), p. 267.

[3]Slotki, Chron., p. 257.

[4]Rudolph, Chronichbücher, p. 267.

many interpreters follow, does violence to the text.[1]

The alternative answer that many suggest is that the whole episode is apocryphal.[2] Three problems underlie this view. First is the clear, detailed prediction in the prophecy. Most Old Testament scholars will allow some sort of predictive element in prophecy, but have difficulty in accepting the idea of such precision or ability to predict details of a fatal illness. Second, there is the problem that the prophetic word comes by letter מִכְתָּב. This is the only instance of this sort of thing in the Old Testament, although מִכְתָּב occurs nine times in the Hebrew sections of the Old Testament, and twice in the Aramaic portions.[3] The verb כתב is very common and the similar idea expressed by ספר is frequent.[4] But the episode under discussion is unique in the early prophets, particularly Elijah and Elisha who are never even considered to be writing prophets.

---

[1]Rudolph, Chronichbücher, p. 267. "Die Änderung von 'Elia' in 'Elisa,' mit der manche Erklärer liebäugeln, ist eine unverantwortliche Gewaltsamkeit."

[2]So Myers, II Chron., p. 122. Curtis, ICC, p. 415, calls it "a pure product of the imagination."

[3]Exod. 32:16 (twice), Deut. 10:4, Ezra 6:18 of the law of Moses; Ezra 1:1, II Chron. 36:22 of the decree of Cyrus; Ezra 7:22 of the decree of Artaxerxes; II Chron. 35:4 of David's instructions for the division of labor in the temple (see below, pp. 173-174); Exod. 39:30 of the inscription affixed to the high priest's turban; Isa. 38:9 of Hezekiah's psalm, and the reference under discussion here.

[4]BDB, p. 507, lists 223 usages of כתב, and on pp. 706-07 lists 185 occurences of the noun סֵפֶר and 107 of the verb סָפַר.

However, this sort of thing does have some precedence. G. Ernest Wright draws attention to four letters from the Mari archives (ca. 1700 B.C.) in which messages from the gods were conveyed to the king.[1] These messengers (apilu) were different from the ordinary type of cultic diviner/prophets. The message the apilum received was an oral message from a god and he was commissioned by that god to deliver it orally. "The message came by inspiration and was delivered when the messenger suddenly appeared unasked and unbidden."[2] The parallels between this episode and that in I Kings 17:1; 18:2, 17 are so obvious that one could almost assume that Wright is describing the latter rather than those at Mari. These Mari letters, containing words of instruction or judgment from the gods to the apilu, are conveyed in writing by a third party when the apilum is not actually present to deliver it to the king. It would be going too far to suggest that these Mari texts provide proof that the II Chron. 21 account is "historical," but they at least provide evidence that in the second millennium B.C. there were situations similar to that described in Chronicles.

The third problem here is the fact that Elijah was involved with a king of Judah. The accounts in Kings give

---

[1]G. Ernest Wright, Biblical Archaeology (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), pp. 97-98. See also Herbert B. Huffmon, "Prophecy in the Mari Letters," BA, XXXI (1968), 101-24, especially pp. 105-09.

[2]Wright, p. 98.

no indication of a Judean ministry for the prophet. It is possible, therefore, that this was the very reason for this method of conveying the message. "Elijah wrote the letter because he did not make personal appearances in Judah."[1] This is a close parallel to the fourth Mari letter Wright discusses. Coupled with this is the problem of the opening words of the oracle, "The Lord, the God of David your father." This is an unusual form of address for Elijah to have used--his usual title for God was Yahweh, the God of Israel. However, a moment's reflection will reveal that this is a very unsuitable name to which to appeal in this situation. Coming from a northern prophet to a southern king it could only be misinterpreted. For a true Judaite, the "god of Israel" was not Yahweh, but Baal. The appeal to Yahweh the "God of your father David" was a potent reminder that Jehoram had not only betrayed the true faith, but also had broken the covenant which Yahweh had established with David.

It is evident that this whole episode raises some complex questions and that none of the proposed answers is entirely satisfactory. However, Rudolph makes an observation which is very important. Arguing on the basis of the use of the name Jehoahaz in II Chron. 21:17 instead of the customary Ahaziah (e.g., II Chron. 22:1), he says that the

---

[1]Francisco, p. 393.

whole presentation, in general, from verse 12 on in its mixture of historical and unhistorical is no free composition of the Chronicler, but presupposes a written source.[1] If this is the case, here is another instance where the Chronicler shows high regard for the integrity of his source documents in spite of the apparent difficulties in them.

The remaining seven prophets referred to in Chronicles and in Samuel and Kings are not quite so well known as Samuel and Elijah. Two of these prophets, already referred to in connection with Samuel and David, are Nathan and Gad. Both are portrayed as part of the team of court historians who recorded the events of David's reign (I Chron. 29:29), and as those who were the messengers of God to David in the matter of the Levitical musicians in the temple (II Chron. 29:25).[2]

---

[1]Rudolph, Chronichbücher, p. 267. "Dass überhaupt die ganze Darstellung v. 12ff in ihrer Mischung von Geschichtlichen und Ungeshichtlichem keine freie Kombination des Chr. ist, sondern eine schriftliche Quelle zur Voraussetzung hat, ergibt sich aus dem Gebrauch des Namens Jehoachas (17) statt des sonst in Rg und Chr üblichen Ahasja (zu 2523 s. dort)."

[2]There is a considerable body of material about David that appears in Chronicles but not in Samuel or Kings: 1. Three genealogical lists; (a) I Chron. 2, a genealogy of Judah and David, (b) I Chron. 3:1-9, the descendants of David, (c) I Chron. 3:10-24, the descendents of David through Solomon. 2. A series of passages in I Chron. 11-12 listing the allies and heros who fought with David, concluding in 12:23-40 with data on the warriors who made David king, and followed in 14:17 with the note that "the fame of David went out into all lands, and the Lord brought the fear of him upon all nations." 3. Extensive details on the bringing of the ark from Kirjath-Jearim to Jerusalem

In addition to these shared responsibilities, Nathan and Gad also appear separately. Nathan, according to I Chron. 17, is the prophetic messenger who reports to David that he will not be the builder of the temple for Yahweh, but that David's son will, and that the line of David will be established permanently. Nathan's presence in the court appears to have been a permanent arrangement, for he appears to be in a position to know all that is going on, including the maneuvering to guarantee the succession to Adonijah (I Kings 1). He knows that the channel of communication to David is through Bathsheba, and knows also of her concern to have her son Solomon declared successor. Thus the intrigue which the author of Kings describes so carefully is omitted entirely by the Chronicler.[1] Nathan apparently outlived his

---

(I Chron. 13:2; 15:1-16; 3:37-43). 4. A lengthy psalm sung on that occasion (16:4-36), which finds parallels in Psa. 105:1-15; 96:1-13; 106:1; 107:1; 118:1; 136:1; 106:47-48. 5. Additional details on the plague that fell on the people because of the census for which God had condemned David (I Chron. 21:14-30, cf. II Sam. 24:15-25). 6. A lengthy section (22:1-29:22), dealing with the convention of leaders, the choice of a temple site, and plans for construction, and directions for the establishing of priestly courses, etc. Without attempting to pre-judge the issue, there is no compelling reason for denying that much of this may have been drawn from the court records of Nathan and Gad.

[1]Nathan appears conspicuously in II Sam. 7, rebuking David for his escapade with Bathsheba. The Chronicler significantly omits any mention of this episode, or for that matter of Bathsheba at all, even though she is the mother of the dynastic line. She appears only as Bathshua [בַּת-שׁוּעַ], not [בַּת-שֶׁבַע], the daughter of Ammiel [עַמִּיאֵל] "my people is strong" (Eliam [אֱלִיעָם] "God is founder of my people" in II Sam. 11:3) in I Chron. 3:5.

contemporary, Gad, for Nathan alone appears in the list of court historians from Solomon's reign (II Chron. 9:29).

Gad's major role in Chronicles is his appearance before David with a message of judgment from Yahweh for David's sin of numbering the people (I Chron. 21). Here, like Nathan, he delivers an unfavorable message without fear of kingly revenge.[1]

Ahijah and Shemiah appear in the accounts of the reign of Rehoboam: Ahijah, with Nathan, recording the affairs of Solomon (II Chron. 9:29), then, after Nathan's death, continuing his prophetic ministry under Rehoboam (II Chron. 10:15); and Shemiah forbidding Rehoboam to use military force to prevent dissolution of the kingdom according to the prophecy of Ahijah (II Chron. 11:3-4). He rebukes Rehoboam (II Chron. 3-8), and, with Iddo, is recognized as the chronicler of the reign of Rehoboam (II Chron. 12:15).

Micaiah and Jehu, son of Hanani, seem to be itinerant prophets, moving freely between Judah and Israel; Michaiah bringing the word of doom to Ahab in the presence of Jehoshaphat (II Chron. 18),[2] and Jehu rebuking Jehoshaphat

---

[1]The Chronicler, in spite of his high view of the Davidic kingdom, does not portray his hero as perfect. He is selective in his treatment, but gives an honest picture of his subject.

[2]One wonders where Elijah was at this time, and why Michaiah was the messenger to the king. A possibility is that Michaiah was more of a regular member of the court circles, perhaps as a sort of roving ambassador, and therefore more apt to be listened to than a stranger like Elijah.

after the death of Ahab in battle (II Chron. 19:2). Jehu is named as the historian of the reign of Jehoshaphat (II Chron. 20:34), in spite of his traffic with Baasha of Israel (I Kings 16). Young has what seems to be a valid deduction concerning the work of Jehu. He states that "the words of Jehu" are

> said to have been "inserted [ho'alah] upon the book of the kings of Israel." Apparently, therefore, the other works still remained distinct from this history. Also, this historical work from which the author of Chronicles drew was compiled not only from historical but also from prophetical writings.[1]

The final member of this group is Huldah, the prophetess, who passed favorable judgment on the Book of the Law that so greatly influenced Josiah's reform movement. This record in II Chron. 34:22-28 is a very close parallel to that in II Kings 22:14-20.

The third group of prophets mentioned by the Chronicler, those who are unknown apart from the mention in Chron.-Ezra-Neh., includes three men, one woman, and one nameless prophet identified only as "the man of God" איש האלהים.[2] Four appear only once. Azariah, the son

---

[1]Young, Introduction, p. 417.

[2]In addition to these, there is the account in I Chron. 25:1-3 of the sons of Asaph "prophesying" הנביאים with musical instruments "under the direction of Asaph, who prophesied under the direction of the king" (v. 2). The role of music in conjunction with the ecstatic movement is well known. (See J. Lindblom, Prophecy in Ancient Israel [Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962], pp. 59-60). But the precise nature of this prophesying is vague, except that it consisted of at least thanksgiving and praise to Yahweh

of Oded, is responsible for calling Asa away from the idolatrous practices followed by his mother Maacah (II Chron. 15:1-19).[1] In II Chron. 20:35-37, a prophet called Eliezer, the son of Dodavahu, appears to rebuke Jehoshaphat for an alliance with Ahaziah of Israel. The trading expedition planned by the two kings failed, as the ships were wrecked.

The references to an unknown "man of God" (II Chron. 25:7, 15) are interesting.[2] The title appears to have been

---

(v. 3). For further discussion of the role of the cultic musicians, see below, pp. 152-155.

[1]The reference in II Chron. 15:8 to "Oded the prophet" poses a bit of a problem. The MT reads וכשמע אסא הדברים האלה והנבואה עדד הנביא..., LXX^{B} reads καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀκοῦσαι τοὺς λόγους τούτους καὶ τὴν προφητείαν Αδαδ τοῦ προφήτου and LXX^{A} reads προφητειαν Αδαδ Αζαριου. The Vulgate has "Quod cum audisset Asa, verba Scribicet et prophetiam Azariae filii Oded prophetae. . . ." Curtis, ICC, p. 385, treats "Oded the prophet" as "either a gloss . . . or representing a lacuna which should be supplied after [Syr., Vul.] with the reading even the prophecy which Azariah the son of 'Oded had spoken.'" (Curtis' italics). The RSV follows this. Slotki, Chron., p. 227, interprets it the same way in his notes, although his translation follows the MT. He remarks that "some Jewish commentators understand it of another prophecy by Oded which is not recorded in detail." Myers follows this suggestion, reading (II Chron., p. 86), "When Asa heard these words and the prophecy of Oded the prophet. . . ." The readings of the versions are obvious attempts at harmonization with verse one. The MT has the harder reading, so if there is not a scribal error in the transmission of the text, or sheer carelessness on the part of the author, here is one more piece of evidence for the Chronicler's careful use of sources. If he has been accurate here, and if the ו is taken in its noraml conjunctive function, there are two prophecies mentioned here--one by Oded the father and one by Azariah the son.

[2]There may, of course, be two individual prophets here. The absence of the article with נביא in v. 15 tends to support this. However, two individuals would not weaken the case for the Chronicler's careful use of his sources.

a traditional one for describing a prophet.[1] This unknown prophet rebukes Amaziah for hiring Israelite mercenaries for his campaign against Edom and for re-establishing idolatry in Judah. If the Chronicler was as given to the invention of imaginative details as is sometimes held, it would appear reasonable for him to have given this prophet a hypothetical name, or even to have attached the prophecy to one of the known prophets. Yet he did neither.

In Neh. 6:14, a prophetess Noadiah is included with the "rest of the prophets" who supported Tobiah and Sanballat against Nehemiah. It is obvious that the Chronicler does not recognize these as legitimate spokesmen for Yahweh. They are false prophets who can safely be ignored.

The last of this group of otherwise unknown prophets is Iddo the seer. He appears as one of the court historians who, with Ahijah, chronicled the reigns of Solomon (II Chron. 9:29) and Rehoboam (II Chron. 12:15), and as the sole chronicler of the reign of Abijah (II Chron. 13:22). There is, however, the intriguing comment in II Chron. 9:29 that the acts of Solomon are written ". . . in the visions of

---

[1]Cf. Redntorff, TDNT, VI:809. I Kings 20:13, 14, 22, 28, use both אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים and נָבִיא, obviously of the same person (ibid., p. 801, n. 137). The Chronicler uses the expression of Moses (I Chron. 23:14; II Chron. 30:16, Ezra 3:2), of David (II Chron. 8:14, Neh, 12:24, 36), of Shemiah (II Chron. 11:2), and of this unnamed prophet in II Chron. 25:7, 9. Shemiah is identified in II Chron. 11:2 with the elements of the prophetic office--he is the recipient of the "word of Yahweh" which he was to convey to the king.

Iddo the seer concerning Jeroboam, the son of Nebat." While Jeroboam had been a highly placed official in Solomon's civil service, and naturally would have been included in the official records of the areas under his jurisdiction, his ultimate defection from Rehoboam (following the promise of kingship by Ahijah the Shilonite, another of Solomon's court historians, II Chron. 9:29, cf. I Kings 11:26-40), should have been enough for the Chronicler to ignore him in his listing of sources, unless his concern for accuracy overrode his obvious intent to establish the validity of the David-Solomon-Rehoboam line.

On the basis of the preceding paragraphs, it is evident that the Chronicler did not hesitate to draw on the works of the Judean and Israelite prophets for material to be incorporated into his account. Welch's comment that "the continuance of the kingdom had always been conditioned on the obedience of kings to the word of prophecy which had brought the kingdom into existence,"[1] is a valid observation based on the profound regard which the Chronicler had toward the Torah and its prophetic interpreters, together with his obvious dedication to the offices and officers of the established cult.

4. Other Official Documents--Myers lists only II Chron. 32:10-15, the message of Sennacherib to Hezekiah, and

---

[1]Welch, Work, p. 48.

v. 17, "other letters" of Sennacherib, in this category of source material. In addition, he states that many similar documents were included in the larger sources used by the Chronicler.[1] This is perhaps best illustrated from Myers' treatment of the sources of Ezra-Nehemiah.[2] He acknowledges that much of this material was probably from the temple archives[3] and that other material of a similar nature was found in the archives of Persia.[4]

The Jerusalem material would include such items as the list of temple vessels returned (Ezra 1:9-11), the list of those who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:1-70), the inventory of vessels and bowls (Ezra 8:26-27), the lists of the heads of the families who had returned with Ezra (Ezra 8:1-14), the list of the builders (Neh. 3:1-32), the census list (Neh. 7:6-72a), the lists of the residents of Jerusalem and other towns (Neh. 11:3-36), the lists of the priests and Levites (Neh. 12:1-26), and possibly such items as the Jerusalem copy of the Edict of Cyrus (Ezra 1:2-4), of Artaxerxes' letter to Ezra permitting his return (Ezra 7:12-26), Sanballat's letter to Nehemiah and Nehemiah's reply (Neh. 6:6-8), and the compact that was signed by the people (Neh. 10:1-39). Some of these latter items may, of course, have

---

[1]Myers, I Chron., p. xlviii.

[2]Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. xlviii.

[3]See above, p. 48.

[4]Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 1

been in the personal papers of Ezra and Nehemiah rather than in any official collection, but the nature of the material presupposes for the most part, some official classification.

There are several important problem passages: (a) Ezra 1:9-11. The MT has a list of 2499 individual gold and silver items but a total figure for the list of 5400 items.[1] The RSV follows I Esdras 2:13-15 here, emending the MT so that both the individual items and the total of 5469 items agree. Whether the difference in the MT between the individual items and the total is caused by an error in transcription of one or the other, or whether the total included items not enumerated separately (e.g., small utensils such as forks, etc.), is impossible to decide. (b) The two lists in Ezra 2 and Neh. 7 apparently represent collations of other smaller census lists from family lists and/or records from geographical areas. Myers[2] deals at considerable length with the problem areas and concludes, "No one has yet come up with a fully satisfactory explanation of the purpose of the list, of the place where it stood originally, or the discrepancies between the two recensions."[3] He does say, however, that "the Chronicler has copied the list quite

---

[1] See Ibid., pp. 4-5.

[2] Ibid., pp. 13-22, 142-48, and Appendix I, pp. 223-33.

[3] Ibid., p. 14.

closely and accurately. . . ."[1] Myers' conclusion is based on an assumption that there is really one list here.

Allrick proposes an attractive alternative. In a brief but important article[2] in which he discusses the archaic Hebrew method of recording numerical values by means of a series of vertical and horizontal strokes, with or without "hooks" for the units and tens, and with stylized letters and abbreviations for the hundreds and thousands in place of the later method of assigning numerical values to the letters, he states, "No variants in these lists are traceable with any probability to difficulties with numerals written by the use of alphabetic letters."[3] Rather, "the larger share of the differences are certainly best explained by the proposition that originally these lists had employed the early Hebrew . . . numeral notation and the problems are largely inherited from that notation."[4] After commenting that this ancient notation was very apt to become unclear in manuscripts which received much handling, he concludes that these lists are "remains of ancient census lists . . . documents vested with reality and antiquity by the very blemishes

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

[2] H. L. Allrick, "The Lists of Zerubbabel (Nehemiah 7 and Ezra 2) and the Hebrew Numerical Notation," Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXVI (1954), 21-27.

[3] Ibid., p. 26.

[4] Ibid.

and signs of use they exhibit."[1]

(c) There is disagreement as to the translation of Ezra 8:26b. The MT reads

וְאִשְׁקְלָה עַל-יְדָם כֶּסֶף כִּכָּרִים שֵׁשׁ-מֵאוֹת וַחֲמִשִּׁים

וּכְלֵי-כֶסֶף מֵאָה לְכִכָּרִים זָהָב מֵאָה כִּכָּר׃

and the LXX has καὶ ἔστησα ἐπὶ χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἑξακόσαι πεντήκοντα, καὶ σκεύη ἀργυρᾶ ἑκατόν, καὶ τάλαντα χρυσίου ἑκατόν. The ASV translates ". . . and silver vessels a hundred talents." The RSV has "silver vessels worth a hundred talents." Myers, conjecturing that there is a number missing from the MT, translates "a hundred vessels of silver valued at . . . talents."[2] Rudolph and Galling read לככרים as a dual form, pointing it לְכִכְּרַיִם, "two talents." This would be about 151 pounds.[3] A hundred silver vessels averaging one-and-a-half pounds each would be a sizable collection. However, the description of the other vessels in this context suggests a higher figure to be more appropriate. Perhaps this is another example of the problem Allrick discusses in connection with the lists in Ezra 2 and Neh. 7.

(d) The list of the heads of the families of those who returned with Ezra (Ezra 8:1-14) differs both in order

---

[1]Ibid., p. 29.

[2]Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 67. See also Frank Michaeli, Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie, vol. XVI Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1967), p. 299.

[3]According to Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 68.

and in content from the lists in Ezra 2, 10 and Neh. 7, 10,[1] but since the Chronicler is dealing with different situations there is no reason why the lists should be identical.[2]

A more important problem here is the shift of the priests from the Zadokite line in Ezra 2 to the Aaronide line in Ezra 8.[3] However, I Chron. 6:4, 8 has Zadok as a descendant of Eleazar the son of Aaron,[4] so this shift poses no problem within the larger context of the Chronicler's work.

(e) The list of builders in Neh. 3:1-32, is, according to Myers,[5] an excerpt from the temple archives which sheds important light on the functioning of guilds in the restoration period, and on the extent of the re-establishment of Jerusalem-centered control over the outlying territory. The statements in vv. 22-24 of landmarks related to private property are taken by Kenyon[6] to indicate that the damage to the Solomonic eastern wall was so extensive (cf. Neh. 2:14), that it was necessary to reconstruct the city defenses on

---

[1]See Ibid., pp. 68-70.

[2]Ezra 2 and Neh. 7 are the list of those who returned with Zerubbabel. Ezra 10 is the list of those who married foreign wives, and Neh. 10 is a list of those who entered into covenant under Nehemiah's leadership.

[3]See Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 69 for bibliography on this.

[4]See below. pp. 135-141. [5]Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 112.

[6]Kathleen M. Kenyon, Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967), pp. 110-11.

the eastern crest of the hill, well within the old monarchial wall line.[1] This rather drastic diminution of the area of the city following the return from Babylon is explicable in the light of the relatively smaller population living there. The length of this smaller wall was "probably about 2600 meters."[2] In contrast, the line of the old wall was over 4000 meters.[3] This fits better with the time span of fifty-two days required for the rebuilding (Neh. 6:15).

(f) The list of residents (Neh. 11:3-36) is similar to the list preserved in I Chron. 9:2-44, but with significant differences. The MT has about seventy-one names in Chron. and about eighty-one in Neh., but with only about thirty-five appearing in both lists.[4] A deliberate selection from common sources[5] to meet two different situations appears to be the best explanation--Chronicles to the time of the restored temple at the end of the sixth century and

---

[1]Kathleen M. Kenyon, Archaeology in the Holy Land (3rd ed.; New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970), p. 243 notes that the British Schools of Archaeology excavations in Jerusalem in 1961 found that these defenses on the crest of the hill were late (Post-exilic and Maccabean), and that the original town wall, in use from 1800 B.C. to the eighth century B.C. (that is the Jebusite and Davidic wall) was 160' further east and 83' further down the slope.

[2]Kenyon, Jerusalem, p. 110.

[3]Cf. Judah J. Slotki, Daniel.Ezra.Nehemiah, The Soncino Books of the Bible (London: The Soncino Press, 1951), p. 196.

[4]Myers, I Chron., p. 67.

[5]Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 185 suggests archival material.

Nehemiah to the time of his work in the second half of the fifth century.[1]

(g) The list of the priests and Levites in Neh. 12:1-26 differs considerably from the lists preserved in Neh. 10 and I Chron. 24:7-18. The key problem here is the list of six high priests in v. 10. If the Jaddua mentioned here is the one mentioned by Josephus as being High Priest when Alexander arrived in Jerusalem, this text is evidence for a late date for at least this part of the book. However, as indicated above[2] there is growing evidence to support the view that a series of high priests bore the names Johanan and Jaddua, so that the account here need not extend much beyond the end of the fifth century.

(h) Ezra 1:2-4 is probably the version of Cyrus' decree recorded by one of the Hebrew scribes. The Ezra version is identical with II Chron. 32:23 except for the substitution of יְהִי for יהוה in the parenthetical clause and the additional material after the command "let him go up." The Aramaic version recorded in Ezra 6:3-5 incorporated as a preface to Darius' letter to Tattenai differs in detail and is obviously an independent document preserved in the

---

[1]See Myers, I Chron., pp. 66-73, and Ezra-Neh., pp. 185-92 for extensive discussion with bibliography on the alternatives.

[2]See above, pp. 21-25 and the bibliography in n. 2, p. 27.

Persian archives.[1] The Cyrus Cylinder substantiates the general pattern of the account preserved here.[2]

(i) Ezra 7:12-26 is an Aramaic document with a Hebrew introduction (v. 11)[3] that indicates that Ezra had a high position in the Persian court,[4] and that he was entrusted with a royal mission to Judah. Myers notes that this section is "doubtless Ezra's copy of the official order issued to him by the king, permitting those Israelites residing in the kingdom, presumably in the eastern regions, who were minded to do so to accompany the royal agent to Jerusalem."[5] There is no conflict here with the earlier decree of Cyrus.

(j) The letters between Sanballat and Nehemiah (Neh. 6:6-8) may have been preserved in the official records or

---

[1]So Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 5. See additional bibliography there.

[2]See James B. Pritchard (ed.), Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament (2nd ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955), p. 316, and William Foxwell Albright, "The Biblical Period," The Jews: Their History, Culture, and Religion, ed. by Louis Finkelstein (3rd ed.; n.p.: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1960), pp. 49-50.

[3]Browne, Early Judaism, p. 41, remarks in this context, that the "source of this Hebrew introduction is to be found only in the Chronicler's use of Haggai and Zechariah, and that the Aramaic source contained letters and decrees, but no intervening history." This tends to support the idea of official records being available to the Chronicler.

[4]See Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 60.

[5]Ibid., p. 61.

simply in the personal papers of Nehemiah.[1] In either case, they were available for the author of this section to use. Such other material as Ezra's prayers (Ezra 9:6-15, Neh. 9:6-37), Nehemiah's prayers (Neh. 1:5-11), the record of the dedication ceremony (Neh. 12:27-43), and the account of the reading of the law may also be included here.

(k) In Neh. 10:1-39 there is a list of those who signed the reform covenant sponsored by Nehemiah. Its official character is attested by the fact that both religious and civil leaders affixed their signatures, and that the document was "sealed" (v. 1).[2] The primacy of the civil leader, Nehemiah, over the priests and Levites suggests that the high priest had not yet attained unchallenged leadership in the Jerusalem community.[3]

Material which appears to have been drawn from non-Judean archives includes the series of letters exchanged by the accusers of the returned exiles and the kings Xerxes, Artaxerxes, and Darius (Ezra 4:11-16, 17-22; 5:7-17; 6:2-5, 6:12). These include the decree of Cyrus mentioned above, as well as the decrees concerning the rebuilding of the city.

---

[1]Myers, ibid., p. 21 remarks that the Chronicler used the memoirs of Nehemiah "substantially in the (written) form in which they now appear."

[2]Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 175.

[3]This may strengthen the case for a mid-fifth century date for this material. Cf. John Bright, A History of Israel (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959), pp. 362-69.

There are some obvious questions regarding the source and access to this material, but in spite of the problems noted, it gives evidence of being based on substantial historical data which were available to the Chronicler and which he used with care.

5. Other Materials--This fifth category is limited by Myers to three items: (a) the words of David and Asaph (II Chron. 29:30), which may be certain Psalms attributed to these two, although none is actually quoted in this context; (b) the document containing the plans for the construction of the temple (I Chron, 28:11-19); and (c) the "Lamentations" discussed above.[1] These are rather obvious, needing little further elaboration, but there is evidence that the Chronicler had other, less obvious sources available to him. Much of this is in apparently secondary detail in larger accounts, but the fact that these details check out with recent archeological data lends credence to the contention that the Chronicler was actually a competent historian who drew carefully from other source materials.

In II Chron. 34:6, the activity of Josiah is said to have extended northward into Galilee as far as the territory of Naphtali, the boundary state of the old Northern

---

[1]See above, p. 57, n. 1. Myers, I Chron., p. xlvii, declares that "these are obviously the Lamentations of Jeremiah" and equates this with the canonical book in spite of the different subject matter.

Kingdom. This account is found only in Chron. (although II Kings 23:15-20 records that the later reform of Josiah spread as far as Bethel and the cities of Samaria), and may be considered another "elaboration" by the Chronicler as he argues his case for the unity of the nation under the Davidic line. However, the decline of Assyrian power following the death of Asshurbanipal (ca. 627 B.C.) opened the way for the re-establishing of Judean political influence over the northern territory.[1]

II Chron. 28:17-19 indicates that the Edomites and Philistines had moved against Judah while Israel was engaged in campaigning against Syria, capturing several cities, including Beth-Shemesh. Emerton[2] suggests that the Chronicler was using an old source here rather than depending on Kings (II Kings 16:7-8 parallels II Chron. 28:16, 21). The key point here is that the excavations reveal no trace of Philistine occupation of the site after the destruction of the

---

[1]See, e.g., Bright, History, pp. 295-302, and cf. H. H. Rowley, "The Prophet Jeremiah and the Book of Deuteronomy," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy, ed. by H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950), p. 165. The discovery of some seventh-century Hebrew inscriptions near Yavneh-yam indicates that the biblical witness of Josiah's political activity in the far north is substantially correct. Cf. Bright, History, p. 297; Myers, II Chron., p. 206. The article by J. Naveh, "A Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century B.C.," Israel Exploration Journal, X (1960), 129-39 has more detail.

[2]J. A. Emerton, "Beth-Shemesh," Archaeology and Old Testament Study, ed. by D. Winton Thomas (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967), pp. 197, n. 2, 203-04.

Stratum III city about 1000 B.C.[1] Stratum IIa, a non-Philistine culture, was destroyed in the second half of the tenth century, apparently due to accidental fire rather than to military defeat,[2] and Stratum IIb, its immediate successor, was destroyed towards the end of the eighth century.[3] At this point there was a break in the occupation of the site, and it was left abandoned, to be rebuilt only in the late sixth century.[4] If Kenyon's interpretation of the data is correct (rather than Emerton's), there was an extended period of time during which the site was unoccupied. If in fact a Philistine destruction of the site occurred in the late eighth century, but the Philistines did not re-establish a city there but left it abandoned, there would of course be no evidence of a new Philistine culture on the site. Emerton's suggestion that Chronicles is using an old source really fits well with Kenyon's point of view. Beth-Shemesh was either still in ruins or was a "new" city during the time of the compiling of the Kings account and therefore possibly not worthy of mention in his record. The Chronicler, on the

---

[1] Kenyon, Arch., p. 253. [2] Ibid., pp. 273f.

[3] Ibid., p. 286.

[4] Ibid., pp. 289-90. Kenyon's conclusions here are at variance with Emerton's. He leaned towards the suggestion of Aharoni that the gap between IIb and IIc should be limited to ca. 795-750 B.C. IIc was built ca. 750 B.C. and lasted until 586 B.C. This is the basis for his statement "Nor does there seem to be any trace of the Philistine capture of the city recorded in 2 Chron. xxviii.18" (p. 203).

other hand, carefully records the event of its loss in spite of the negative effect that fact had upon his history.[1]

The account of the invasion of Judah by Shishak (II Chron. 12:1-9) is treated briefly by the writer of Kings (only two verses, I Kings 14:25-26). The more extensive treatment by the Chronicler is derived from "another source which gave a fuller account and thus has preserved for us data corroborated by archeological discoveries and Egyptian historical lists."[2] Included in this source was reference to the "enigmatic Sukkiim" [סַכִּיִּים].[3] Long identified as "cave-dwellers" (following the LXX Τρωγλοδυται), they were unknown apart from this single reference in Chronicles.[4] It is known now, however,[5] that the Sukkiim were "in fact . . . scouts or light-armed auxiliaries, perhaps of Libyan origin."[6]

---

[1]Myers, II Chron., p. 163 lists several articles indicating outside sources for the Chronicler's information.

[2]Myers, II Chron., p. 74.

[3]K. A. Kitchen, Ancient Orient and Old Testament (London: Tyndale Press, 1966), p. 159.

[4]See the various conjectures in, e.g., Max W. Muller, "Sukkiims," Encyclopaedia Biblica, IV, pp. 4820-21, most of which assume the Chronicler made some error of understanding or recording the name.

[5]A. H. Gardiner, The Wilbour Papyrus, II: Commentary (London: Oxford University Press, 1948), p. 81, n. 1.

[6]Kitchen, Ancient Orient, p. 159. Cf. Albright in Old Testament in Modern Study, p. 18. Kitchen observes that they appear in 13th century texts as TJUKU or TJUKTEN, but the identification was not certain until the more recent discoveries.

Another curious reference is in I Chron. 11:4f where the old name "Jebus" [יבוס] is used for Jerusalem. The only other use of this name in the Old Testament is in Judges 19:10f, the story of the murder of the Levite's concubine by the men of Gibeah. The texts reverse the order [Judg. 19:10 יבוס היא ירושלם; I Chron. 11:4 ירושלם היא יבוס], but the identification is obvious, and in both cases the city is identified as a city of foreigners. There may be some significance in the fact that these references are to a Levite and to David, the two prime interests of the Chronicler. Further, this may indicate a detailed knowledge of the Judges' record by the Chronicler or a common source from which both these instances were drawn.

A considerable amount of space is devoted by the Chronicler to a description of the Temple structure (I Chron. 22; 28:11-29:19, and II Chron. 2-5). Much of this, especially II Chron. 3-4, is summarized from the more extensive account in I Kings 6-7. These descriptions lack much of the technical architectural detail necessary for reconstructing the building, but do convey the impression of wonder at the magnificence of the structure itself. Sufficient detail has been given, however, so that, on the basis of the Kings-Chronicles descriptions, clear parallels can be drawn between the Solomonic temple and known examples of temples from the late second millennium B.C. in Syria-Palestine. The third millennium B.C. Semitic temples are patterned

after the old Assyrian temples, but in the second millennium, as evidenced by the Hazor sanctuary (ca. 1400 B.C.), the Tell Tainat temple in Syria (ca. 1000 B.C.), and Building IV at Hamath, the pattern was modified. The Solomonic temple, according to the biblical descriptions, was modeled on these latter designs with the three main rooms of the sanctuary placed one behind the other in a straight line. The method of constructing the walls with courses of brick or stone locked together with wooden framing (I Kings 6:36; 7:12; Ezra 6:4), has also been identified in these other temples.[1]

The recent excavations at Tell Arad in the Negeb have also provided an explanation for a couple of difficult phrases in the Chronicler's account. In II Chron. 3:3, the Chronicler, describing the dimensions of Solomon's temple, adds to the Kings account "in cubits of the old standard" [בַּמִּדָּה הָרִאשׁוֹנָה]. At Arad,[2] the Stratum XI (early tenth

---

[1]For a general description, with bibliography, see de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 282-83, 313-21, and 519-23. Works of particular importance are C. W. McEwan, "The Syrian Expedition of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago," American Journal of Archeology, XLI (1937), 9-13, on Tell Tainat, and Yigel Yadin, "Excavations at Hazor, 1957," IEJ, VIII (1958), 11-14. Cf. also M. Avi-Yonah and S. Yeivin, "Places of Worship and Sanctuaries," Ch. 2 of The Antiquities of Israel, I (Tel Aviv; 1955), pp. 145-204.

[2]See Yohanan Aharoni, "The Israelite Sanctuary at Arad," New Directions in Biblical Archeology, ed. by David Noel Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Co., 1969), pp. 25-39; Yohanan Aharoni, "The Negeb," Archeology and Old Testament Study, ed. by D. W. Thomas, pp. 384-403; and Yohanan Aharoni, "Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple," Biblical Archaeologist, XXXI (1968), 2-32.

century) holy place measures nine meters long, that is precisely twenty "short cubits," the recorded measure of the Solomonic temple at Jerusalem. In Stratum X (late tenth century-early ninth century), the holy place was enlarged to 10.5 meters, that is, to twenty "royal cubits." Aharoni reasons from this that the standard of measure was changed in Israel, possibly due to Egyptian influence, between the tenth and ninth centuries. He goes on to say, "After the change, the measurements of the Jerusalem temple were not in accord with the current standard, but in accord with the 'first measure' which was no longer in use."[1]

In II Chron. 3:17, reference is made to two pillars set up "in front of the temple" [עַל-פְּנֵי הַהֵיכָל]. In spite of this text, in descriptions and reconstructions of the temple, these pillars are usually placed in the courtyard [הָאוּלָם] rather than in front of the הֵיכָל. Aharoni notes that at Arad, as in Canaanite and Phoenician temples, these pillars are inside the first room, at the entrance to the הֵיכָל.[2] Since seals and ostraca found at the site indicate that this was an Israelite sanctuary devoted to Yahweh,[3] from the same period as the Solomonic temple, the similarities between the

---

[1]Aharoni, New Directions, p. 36.

[2]Ibid., p. 34; Aharoni, Biblical Archaeologist, pp. 18-22.

[3]Aharoni, Biblical Archaeologist, pp. 9-16.

Arad temple and the description of Solomon's temple suggest that the Chronicler is correct in his placing the pillars before the היכל rather than before the court.[1]

These two details suggest that the Chronicler had accurate knowledge of the Solomonic temple, and that he was working carefully with materials which had their origin well back in the early monarchy.

Finally Richardson[2] gives three other examples illustrating the Chronicler's careful use of sources for information he presents which is not in the Samuel-Kings account. The first is the confirmation of the chronological sequence in II Chron. 15:19-16:6 by the "Ben Hadad Stele" which clarifies the relation of Ben Hadad and the kings of Judah and Israel. This stele, dating from ca. 850 B.C.,[3]

---

[1]The basic difference between the two temples is that the second dimension is totally different--forty (or sixty including the דְּבִיר) cubits at Jerusalem, six cubits at Arad. However, this does not seem as crucial as first glance would suggest. In both the temples, the twenty-cubit dimension is the north to south measure and the temples are oriented on an east-west axis from door to holy place. The result is that at Jerusalem, the הֵיכָל is a long room with the entrance on a short side, while at Arad, the הֵיכָל is a broad room with the entrance on a long side. Aharoni discussed this at some length, offering a tentative solution to the problem. See Ibid., pp. 22-25.

[2]H. Neil Richardson, "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles," Journal of Bible and Religion, XXVI (1958), 9-12.

[3]Albright, "A Votive Stele Erected by Ban-Hadad I of Damascus to the God Melcarth," Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research, LXXXVII (1942), 22 sets the outside limits for the stele as 875-825 B.C. He prefers mid-century as the actual date.

toward the close of Ben-Hadad's reign, identifies him as the "son of Tab-Ramman,"[1] and clearly links him with the biblical Ben Hadad, reigning in the thirty-sixth year of Asa[2] and still ruling from Damascus and in alliance with Ahab at the battle of Qarqar in 853 B.C.

The second is the indirect confirmation of the statements of the Chronicler in II Chron. 17:12 that Jehoshaphat "built in Judah fortresses and store cities," and in II Chron. 26:10 that Uzziah "built towers in the wilderness and hewed out many cisterns." Richardson points out that the expedition of Cross and Milik at Wadi Buqê'ah northeast of Bethlehem near Qumran discovered an Iron II settlement of the ninth to sixth centuries B.C. that included casemate defenses, masonry, rock-cut cisterns and irrigation systems. Here is strong supportive material for Chronicles.

Richardson's third example involves the statement in II Chron. 35:20 that Neco of Egypt "went up to fight at Carchemish on the Euphrates and Josiah went out against him." Two tablets in the British Museum collection are cited as evidence for constant conflict between Babylon and Egypt from 612 to 605 B.C. For the last four or five years of

---

[1] Ibid., p. 26, acknowledges that the inscription is defective in line two where these family names are, but insists that there are enough legible letters to remove any doubt of at least the father's name.

[2] Either 877 B.C. (Albright) or 875 (Theile).

that period Egypt had a substantial military contingent established on the west bank of the Euphrates. In 609, Babylon attacked Haran, fifty-five miles east of Carchemish, and Pharaoh Neco led his troops up to reinforce the Carchemish garrison. According to Chronicles, Josiah, perhaps anticipating a Babylonian victory, tried to interdict the Egyptian reserves and was killed in the ensuing battle at Megiddo.[1] These tablets support the Chronicler's statement.

Albright's statement that "there can be no reasonable doubt that there were more extensive remains of the pre-exilic Jewish annalistic sources available about 400 B.C. than there were a few centuries later"[2] summarizes the situation accurately. The evidence now available rather clearly sustains the position that much of the hitherto "imaginative" work of the Chronicler was, in fact, carefully drawn from extant source material and deserves to be recognized as historically valid.[3]

---

[1]See Richardson, Journal of Bible and Religion, p. 12, n. 16 for bibliography and cf. David Noel Freedman, "The Babylonian Chronicle," Biblical Archaeologist, XIX (1950), 50-60, esp. pp. 51-53. Freedman, p. 53, n. 10 surmised Josiah to be either an ally or a vassal to Babylon.

[2]Albright, Bulletin of American Schools Oriental Research, p. 27.

[3]Myers, I Chron., p. lxiii, declares, "Within the limits of its purpose, the Chronicler's story is accurate wherever it can be checked, though the method of presentation is homiletical." Cf. also Werner Lemke, "Studies in the History of the Chronicler" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1964).

CHAPTER III

OLD TESTAMENT TRADITIONS OF THE ORIGIN OF THE PRIESTHOOD

A study of the origin of the Israelite priesthood is complicated by the fact that, apart from the traditional materials preserved in the biblical records, there is limited evidence to which to appeal. There are some known parallels in ancient Near Eastern texts which reveal some of the priestly practices and orders of Israel's predecessors and neighbors. These will be discussed below at the appropriate points. Presently, the best that can be done is to examine critically Israel's own traditions (in the light of their own witness) recognizing always that care must be taken not to demand more of them than they can legitimately bear. To that end, this chapter will deal with the specific question of how the origin of the priesthood is described in the various parts of the Hebrew canon other than in the work of the Chronicler.

There are, of course, widely divergent views on the validity of these traditions.[1] It is outside the scope of

---

[1]The classic Wellhausian critical position, in its most refined form, can be found in the introductions by Driver, Pfeiffer, and Eissfeldt. A more conservative point of view is found in the introductions by Young and Harrison. A mediating position that deserves careful consideration is

this dissertation to examine in detail the various theories and possibilities; yet in the final analysis, for the purposes of this dissertation, these differences of opinion are not particularly relevant. For the Chronicler, at least, there was no question but that the traditional views of the canon and its history were correct. The serious questions of source and form which confront the modern Old Testament researcher were probably beyond his wildest imaginations--he treated the documents at their face value.

1. The Pentateuch

The Pentateuch is an account which seeks to present the history of the people of Israel from the earliest times down to their arrival at the borders of Canaan. Accordingly, it has several strands of tradition regarding the

---

that expressed by Kaufmann in his Religion of Israel, esp. pp. 175-211, on the antiquity of the priestly code in the Torah. Pentateuchal criticism has, for the most part, carried the field with its identification and classification of the J E D P sources behind the documents. Kaufmann, however, along with other Israeli scholars such as Cassutto, has reopened for serious consideration the position long held by men like R. D. Wilson, O. T. Allis, and E. J. Young. He states in his Religion of Israel, pp. 1-2, that the basic postulate of classical criticism, "that the priestly stratum of the Torah was composed in the Babylonian exile, and that the literature of the Torah was still being written and revised in and after the Exile--is untenable. The Torah . . . is the literary product of the earliest stage of Israelite religion, the stage prior to literary prophecy. Although its compilation and canonization took place late, its sources are demonstrably ancient--not in part, not in their general content, but in their entirety, even to their language and formulation."

development of the priesthood among the Israelites.

1. Family Priests

The accounts of the earliest period, prior to the Exodus, know nothing of an established priesthood. Yet that is not to say that there were no priests. The innate religious impulses in man drive him to worship and as a result, the need for cult specialists produces early in the evolution of social and religious practices, a priesthood of sorts.[1] The nature of cult inhibits the revelation of the cult secrets, and therefore the role of the priest becomes significant.[2] The early close relationships between prosperity for the nation and the influence of the cult is reflected in the root כהן which has the "ancient meaning . . . to make prosperous, flourish, abound with wealth."[3]

An examination of the use of the term "priest" כהן indicates that the word refers to both an office and a function. A priest is one who by virtue of his appointment (either on the basis of family lineage or independently), is to function as a cultic leader of the people. However, it is vital to note that the function is dependent upon the

---

[1]Meek, "Religious Origins," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures (1921), 111.

[2]Cody, p. 11. "We know quite a lot about the pantheon and the religious myths of the Phoenician court, but little about clergy and concrete religious practices."

[3]Cody, p. 28. On pp. 26-29 he has an extensive discussion of the possible etymologies of כהן.

appointment, not the title upon the function.[1]

Earlier scholarship tended to link the word with the Arabic كَاهِنٌ "soothsayer or seer," and argue for service at a shrine as the basis for the revelatory work of the כהן.[2] However, since the Ugaritic discoveries and the recent illumination of Canaanite backgrounds, it has become obvious that the line of transmission is rather through the Northwest Semitic languages, specifically the Ugaritic khn, "the cultic official in the sanctuary in a general sense."[3]

There are parallels in the Phoenician and Punic inscriptions of the fourth to second centuries B.C. for khnm. Cody comments that they were "men in charge of sanctuaries, and that in the larger sanctuaries, they had a fairly

---

[1]See below, pp. 97-107 on the Levites.

[2]So, e.g., Smith & Bertholet, Ency. Biblica, III, 3840-41. Cf. BDB, pp. 462f. Cody, p. 18, n. 50, argues that the absence of the title kâhin from the the South Arabian dialects supports the theory that the word was a N.W. Semitic loan word in N. Arabic. See also Meek, "Origins," AJSLL (1921), 124-25, who argues for this meaning on the basis that all the early references to priests (Judg. 18:5f; I Sam. 14:18, 36ff; 23:9ff; Deut. 33:8) indicate that the giving of oracles was the most important priestly function.

[3]Hans Joachim Kraus, Worship in Israel, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1966), p. 95. Baudissin, Geschichte, p. 269, defined the priest as "one who served the divinity at the altar." Smith and Bertholet, Ency. Bib., III, 3838, identify the priest as "a minister whose stated business was to perform, on behalf of the community, certain public ritual acts, particularly sacrifices, directed godwards." But both of these definitions are too narrow. Kraus' broader definition is more satisfactory.

numerous and diversified body of cultic personnel under them.[1] However, the late date of the literature may reflect the concept of priesthood already known from post-exilic Israel rather than contributing any fresh understanding of the origin of the כהנים. G. B. Gray indicates that although the cognates of כהן were widespread in the ancient Near East, only in Hebrew and Phoenician is it used for a cultic official.[2]

Gray, of course, wrote before the discovery of the Ugaritic materials at Ras Shamra. These, as noted above, have vindicated Gray's contention that כהן is a Canaanite term.[3] If this is essentially correct, there is a body of evidence that indicates that the priestly functions of

---

[1] Cody, p. 22, and n. 66.

[2] George Buchanan Gray, Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), pp. 181-82. The term כהן does not occur in Assyrian or in the dialects of south Arabia. In Arabic it is used of soothsayers who were not directly associated with the cult. It does not appear in the old Aramaic, but is found in the Jewish Aramaic documents of the fifth century B.C. along with the Aramaic כמר. The Aramaic expresses the idea of כהן by the use of כמר. כהן is used exclusively of the priests of Yahweh (including Melchizedek) and the Jewish priests. All others are כמרים. Gray concludes from this that כמר was the original Aramaic term for priest and that כהן is a Hebrew loan-word in Aramaic. כהן is a Canaanite term.

[3] Ibid., p. 183, states that this term is "most naturally attributed to Canaan rather than a pre-Canaanite stage of the history of the Hebrew." However, if Gordon's thesis (Gordon, Common Background, p. 7) has any validity, there may be links as early as 1800 B.C. between the Semites and the Phoenicians.

propitiation of the deity, sacrifice, etc., were carried on in the earliest times of the Israelite patriarchs. These ideas appear to have been accepted by the Chronicler and were influential in shaping his theology of the cult and the priesthood.

In that period, the privilege of sacrifice was open to the head of the individual family or to his delegated representative. Beginning with the earliest stories of the patriarchs (Gen. 4:3-7; 8:20; 22:13; 35:54; 46:1), these men offered sacrifices and performed "priestly" duties. There is nothing to indicate the way in which these individuals "became" priests, nor is there any suggestion as to how knowledge of the practice of the cultic ritual was conveyed to them. They simply act and offer the sacrifices.[1]

In the cluster of events surrounding the Exodus, the tradition of family priests is still evident. At the time of the first Passover, it is the men of Israel--the heads of the families--who sacrifice the lamb and carry out the prescribed ritual (Exod. 12:21-27). Similarly, when the Israelites confirmed the covenant at Sinai, it is the other men rather than the seventy elders or the Aaronides who make the offering and sacrifice.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 111, comments: "The priesthood--or its lack--in the patriarchal period as the pentateuch presents it is that of Semitic nomads, not of Phoenicia and Canaan, while the influence of Phoenicia or Canaan on the development of priesthood among the Yahwistic Hebrews in the time of the judges is difficult to isolate."

Even in Leviticus, the right of sacrifice is left in the hands of the worshipper rather than being the exclusive right of the priest.[1] The priests, certainly, carry out the ritual of presenting the blood to Yahweh and of sprinkling the altar, but the critical act--the sacrificing itself--is still the prerogative of the worshipper.

ii. Priestly Families

The Mosaic period, according to the pentateuchal account, marks the transition, at least in theory, to the establishment of a caste of priests in place of the family priests of the patriarchal period. The transition was not abrupt, for the practice of individuals acting as priests continued down to the time of the early monarchy.[2] Nevertheless, the pattern was established during this period.

1. The Levites--A primary problem which must be examined in any study of the Israelite priesthood is the origin of the term "Levites" לוי, and a determination of the group to which it was applied. In the whole of the Old Testament, לוי is used about sixty times as a proper name, and nearly 300 times in reference to a class of cultic officials.[3] Because of this lopsided ratio, it has long been questioned whether or not it is really the name of either an

---

[1] Lev. 1:5; 3:2, 8, 13; 4:28-33.

[2] See below, pp. 110-114. Cf. Lev. 4:24.

[3] BDB, p. 532.

individual or of a secular tribe.[1] Since such a tribe, if it ever existed, was early absorbed into the remaining tribes[2] such a question is understandable.

But it is precisely here that the problem arises. The very ancient evidence of the pericope in Gen. 49:5-7 and of the tradition recorded in Genesis 34, coupled with the distinctly different characteristics attributed to Levi there, in comparison to the later accounts, becomes extremely difficult to explain if the Genesis accounts are totally non-historical.[3] It is unlikely that a group which historically had no territorial claims would be included in an arrangement that purports to represent early alliances unless there was some basis for identifying the group territorially.[4]

---

[1]See Cody, p. 135, n. 117 for a list of those on either side of this issue.

[2]The territorial lists (e.g., Josh. 13-21) are unanimous in assigning the Levites no independent tribal lands, but in locating them in various cities scattered throughout the territories of the other tribes. Cf. Albright, "The List of Levitic Cities," Ginzberg Volume, and John Bright, Early Israel in Recent History Writing, Studies in Biblical Theology No. 19 (London: SCM Press, 1956), pp. 60-62. Cody, p. 35, n. 16 remarks that Gunneweg, Leviten und Priester, p. 55, "shows the weakness in the attempts of Mowinckel and Hoftijzer to establish a greater antiquity for these tribal lists which omit Levi than for those lists which include him."

[3]Specifically, the Genesis accounts stress the violence and evil characteristics of Levi, while the record of Exod. 32:26-28 and Deut. 33:8-11 have nothing but praise for his faithfulness to Yahweh.

[4]DeVaux, Ancient Israel, p. 368, appears to be correct

The first appearance of the name לוי in Genesis is in 29:34. According to that account, Levi was the third son borne to Jacob by Leah, the eldest daughter of his uncle Laban.

There have been many attempts to find a satisfactory derivation for the name. Gray, following Wellhausen, sees a common identification with Leah לְאָה, his mother, which he understands as cognate with لَأْيٌ "wild cow."[1] Such a derivation, while not given credence in more recent literature, would fit admirably into the pattern of names revealing animal comparisons which is evident in Gen. 49.[2] In that context there may be a deliberate emphasis on the difference between the activity of the "wild bull" לוי (v. 5), and the mutilation of the domesticated cattle (oxen?) of the following verse. Such a derivation raises the question of the totemistic idea of sympathetically endowing the child with

---

in rejecting the argument that Gen. 34 is an aetiological narrative to account for the scattering of the tribe. This passage shows none of the characterisitcs of aetiology nor does it make any clear reference to the scattering. Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, p. 267, n. (c), dates the Levi saying as "Late Patriarchal." If this is accurate, it is too close to the event to be properly identified as aetiology.

[1]George Buchanan Gray, Studies in Hebrew Proper Names (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896), p. 96.

[2]For an examination of the concept that the tribal sayings in Gen. 49 are based on either word-plays or animal comparisons, see J. H. Gunneweg, "Uber den Sitz im Leben der sog. Stammessprüche (Gen. 49; Dtn. 33; Jdc. 5)," Zeitschrift fur die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LXXVI (1964), 245-55.

the powers of the animal after which it was named--in this case with the emphasis on the wildness of the man.

One other implication of this origin of the name is the possibility of a relationship with the priestly function itself. The predominant place of cows and bulls in the Canaanite cultus, both as sacrificial victims and as deity figures, cannot be ignored. Already there may be here the thought of the priestly character of the Levites, a character much purified later, but with roots in this mythology. The identification of the Ugaritic deity Alyin Ba'al with the bull is clearly established. It is his animal, his sacred symbol, and at times he seems to become personified in it.[1] Ideas from Ugarit were very influential in central and northern Canaan, and perhaps may be seen in this old name.

As is the case for most of the important Old Testament names, a popular derivation is preserved. In Gen. 29:34, Leah says, "Now this time my husband will be joined [ילוה] to me because I have borne him three sons."[2] Several variations on this theme are proposed,[3] including the possi-

---

[1]There is considerable literature available on this point. Probably the best treatment is that of Arvid S. Kapelrud, Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts (Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1952), especially pp. 46-51.

[2]The same play on words is found in Num. 18:2, 4, where the Levites are to "join" Aaron in the tabernacle service.

[3]Eduard Nielsen, Shechem (2nd ed.; Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1955), pp. 264-66 lists several of these, including the two noted in this paragraph.

bility that the event recorded in Exod. 32:26-29 where the Levites "join" Moses in opposing apostasy and are "joined" to the sanctuary at Kadesh,[1] is the origin of the name, or that the expression בני לוי is really "sons of the priests" and equal to "the priests" (on the analogy of the "sons of the prophets"), i.e., those "associé au culte."[2]

Various attempts have been made to relate the word to a root לוה with the sense of "to coil, twist, turn, writhe, whirl" (Arabic لَوَى). Mowinckel understands this as possibly referring to ecstatic ritual dances of the priests in which violent motion was required.[3] However, just how much of this activity was evident in Israelite prophetic circles is a moot point.[4] The same root may be the source of the Leviathan figure (Ugaritic Lothan) which some see reflected in the stories of the brazen serpent from Num. 21:1 down to II Kings 18. However, the evidence for these mean-

---

[1]See below, pp.105-06 on the relationship of the Levites to the Kadesh tradition.

[2]Nielsen, Shechem, p. 265. He attributes the phrase to P. E. Dhorme, La religion des Hébreux Nomads (n.p.: n.p., 1937), pp. 226f. Cf. Ch. Hauret, "Evolution du sacerdoce dans l'Ancien Testament," Assemblées du Seigneur, XCIII (1965), 51.

[3]Sigmund Mowinckel, in Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift, IX (1942), 1-32, especially pp. 22ff, noted in Nielsen, Shechem, p. 266.

[4]See Aubrey R. Johnson, "The Prophet in Israelite Worship," Expository Times, XLVII (1935-36), 312-19; The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel (Cardiff: University of Wales, 1944); and H. H. Rowley, "The Nature of Old Testament Prophecy," The Servant of the Lord: and Other Essays on the Old Testament (London: Lutterworth Press, 1952), pp. 91-128.

ings and practices is extremely tenuous.[1]

One attractive possibility is that לוה means to borrow, to lend, or to give as a pledge, so that a "levite" is one who has been pledged to a deity. Albright,[2] followed by Huffmon,[3] argues that "Levite" designates a class of cultic functionaries who were pledged to the deity and hence set aside and associated with a sanctuary. The evidence discussed by Albright,[4] including the Minean inscriptions and the material from the neo-Babylonian, the Egyptian and the late Canaanite sources, indicates that there was, by the middle of the first millennium B.C., the idea of a cultic functionary associated with the term Levite. However, this does not shed any light on the origin of the term. The Minean inscriptions from El-Ela (Dedan) in northern Arabia, particularly, have been appealed to for support for the idea that לוי is an appellative designation of a class of temple

---

[1]Meek, "Origins," AJSLL (1921), p. 109, 116, sees a close connection between the Levites and a serpent cult. He suggests that Nahash or Nehushtan, (cf. Num. 10:29, Hobab; Exod. 6:23, Nahshon; I Chron: 26:4 LXX^{B} Ναας, and v. 26 Shuppim--all "serpent names") the serpent god was tribal god to Levi, since the snake was associated with occult powers.

[2]Albright, Archeology and the Religion of Israel, pp. 109, 204f.

[3]Herbert H. Huffmon, Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1965), pp. 225f.

[4]Albright, Archeology and the Religion of Israel, pp. 109, 204f.

servants rather than a proper name.[1] But, as noted, these inscriptions date from no earlier than the seventh century B.C. and cannot be presumed to antedate the Levi tradition in Israel.[2]

Cody states that "the name Levi is most probably an authentic person name" perhaps a shortened form of

> Levi-El which occurs in the Mari texts as the Amorite name La-wi-El (written La-wi-An) and in Egyptian texts--which having no l represent the l in foreign names by r or 3--as the foreign name RW'R (syllabic Ra-wi-'i-ra) for Lawi-'la.[3]

At first glance it appears that this derivation is supportive of the concept of the Levite being a cultic functionary, but on closer examination this is not the case. It is significant that Huffmon includes LW' in a list of "Amorite Personal names." Further, this is in agreement with the statement of de Vaux, that more recent and more accurate research into the Minean inscriptions has made it clear that lw' and the feminine lw't

> do not mean "priest" or "priestess," but denote an object given to a god, a pledge. This object may be a person, man or woman, or a thing; but it is never a person engaged in performing the cult. . . .

---

[1]Von Rad, Theology, I, p. 12, n. 21. See Pedersen, Israel, III-IV, p. 680 (n. to p. 170), for discussion and bibliography. Note also the material in Gray, Sacrifice, pp. 242-50; Cody, pp. 30-32; and Kraus, Worship, p. 95.

[2]Albright, Stone Age, p. 251, n. 74. De Vaux, Israel, p. 369, holds that the fourth century B.C. is the earliest possible date for the Mineans in the Dedan area.

[3]Cody, p. 29. Cf. Huffmon, Amorite Personal Names, pp. 225f.

> It is not so evident as is sometimes claimed that "Levite" in Hebrew is primarily the name of a function. It is significant that in the Bible this word occurs only once in the construct state as a common noun (Ne, 10:1) whereas kohen is often used this way ("the priests of Yahweh, of the high places", etc., "my priests, your priests, their priests", etc.). In its form and usage, "Levite" is first and foremost a nomen gentilitium: it means "a descendent of Levi" and there is no reason to reject the biblical tradition which constantly connects the Levites with their ancestor Levi.[1]

Thus, in the light of present evidence, it is impossible to find the source of the term "Levite" in any of the functions the Levites performed. The explanation of Genesis 29 that the word originated as a proper name of one of Jacob's sons appears to have a high degree of probability.[2] In that context, the name means "joined to," picking up the Amorite meaning "pledged to" and associated with someone. Not, of course, that Leah's son was the first boy ever to carry that name, but rather that the practice of forming a proper name from a verbal root was well known.

It appears, then, that the title "Levite," as applied to the cultic functionaries, seems to require some sort of family relationship in order to qualify for "priesthood." In spite of the Genesis tradition, many attempts have been made to find some link with non-Israelite priestly families in an effort to explain the role of the Levites. It has been

---

[1] De Vaux, Israel, pp. 369-70.

[2] Ibid., p. 358. See also Kaufmann, Religion, pp. 193-200, especially p. 196, n. 12.

suggested, for example,[1] that the Levites may have been descendants of the Canaanite priests who had served in the old sanctuaries, and by virtue of that association, continued at sites such as Gilgal (Deut. 11) and Shechem (Deut. 27) after the arrival of the Israelites.

A more important possibility is that suggested by Eichrodt[2] who stresses the strong possibility of a relationship between Moses, the new leader of the Israelites, and the priestly caste of Kadesh, with the result that the latter usurped all the priestly functions in Israel. That Moses had close contacts with the Kadesh priesthood is beyond question--he married the daughter of one of the leaders --but as Gray suggests,[3] the close relationship between Moses and Jethro, the priest of Midian, may have given Moses some insight into the priestly duties, but it does not provide any evidence for a Midianite priesthood to attach itself to the Israelite amphictyony.

According to Deut. 33:8-11, the Israelite priesthood originated in the wilderness experience. Pfeiffer sees the whole of Deut. 33 as the work of a poet living about 960 B.C. but with the present form of vv. 3-11 as a "postexilic

---

[1]W. Carleton Wood, "The Religion of Canaan from the Earliest Times to the Hebrew Conquest," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXV (1916), 222.

[2]Eichrodt, Theology, I, 393-94.

[3]Gray, Sacrifice, pp. 206-08. Cf. Kaufmann, Religion, pp. 242-44.

priestly substitution for an earlier oracle."[1] Albright, on the other hand, argues from the fact that "since the Levites were most popular before the fall of Shiloh we may infer that Deut. 33 . . . was composed about the middle of the eleventh century,"[2] before the fall of that sanctuary.

Meek's statement has merit. "That the Levites were originally a tribe is the unequivocal testimony of the Old Testament narrative. . . . Even in . . . Deut. 33:8-11 [Levi] still figures as a tribe although now entrusted with priestly functions."[3] Welch remarks that in Exodus and Numbers the Levites have no independent function,[4] but serve only as substitutes for the first-born of the Israelites while the priests derive their authority from their hereditary links with Aaron.[5] Certainly the role of substitute is present, but it is not the only emphasis. According to Exod. 32:26-29, the installation of the sons of Levi into the priesthood is "a reward for proven loyalty."[6] Cody classifies this passage as "a fragment of a classical aetiological tradition explaining the appropriateness of priesthood among Levites."[7] He continues with the suggestion that some heroic

---

[1]Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 276-79.

[2]Albright, Yahweh, p. 17. On p. 33 he argues for identifying this poem as part of the J source.

[3]Meek, AJSLL (1939), 113. [4]Welch, PEJ, pp. 228-29.

[5]See below, pp. 108-109.

[6]Eichrodt, Theology, I, 392. [7]Cody, p. 152.

act by some of the Levites opened the way for Mosaic approval of the whole tribe and their appointment to the priesthood.[1]

Deut. 18:1 states that "the Levitical priests, that is, all the tribe of Levi" were to have no territorial inheritance among the Israelites. This seems to indicate a unique place for these people.[2] According to v. 5, they have been chosen out of all the tribes "to minister in the name of the Lord, him and his sons for ever." Cody notes that here

> "Levite" still has a purely ethnic, tribal sense . . . and "priest" has a functional sense. By the compound expression "Levitical priests" men are meant who are priests potentially (in the Deuteronomic program) if not actually, and who belong to the tribal remnant of Levi.[3]

Although the issue is very complex, it appears to this author that the weight of the evidence lies with those who recognize "Levite" to be primarily a tribal or clan name rather than a cultic title.

---

[1]Hauret, "Evolution," p. 49, states more generally "tous les textes relient l'origine du lévitisme à une acte de fidélité héroique." See also Kraus, Worship, pp. 93-100 for summary. He states that Levi was a secular tribe that was dispersed (Gen. 49) and who then fulfilled the priestly office. But the Old Testament does not present "Levi" as a secular tribe at all during the conquest. After Sinai, Levi is always a priestly tribe that is different from the other eleven.

[2]Wright, VT, IV (1954), 325-30 argues that the two phrases are not in apposition to each other, but that the latter is an expansion of the former. Emerton, VT, XII (1962), 129-38 argues for the two being in apposition. See Cody, p. 131, n. 17, for further discussion.

[3]Cody, p. 129.

2. The Sons of Aaron--Apart from the reference to Jethro, the priest of Midian, the earliest reference to priests in Exodus is in 19:6 according to which Yahweh calls Israel to be "a kingdom of priests and a holy nation." In v. 24 a distinction is made between the priests and the people, but no indication is given as to who these priests were or how they had become priests.

As part of the Sinai event, Moses is commanded to bring Aaron and his sons to serve as priests (Exod. 28:1). The role of Aaron has been widely discussed.[1] Kaufmann suggests that the "Aaronides are the ancient pagan priesthood of Israel. Presumably they were then swayed by the message of Moses, supported him and persuaded the people to follow him."[2] This may be the explanation of Exod. 4:14. Aaron is identified as "the Levite" who is a competent spokesman.[3] However, no detailed description is given of their position until the event in Exod. 28 when Moses became a priest for one week in order to consecrate Aaron and his sons exclusively.

---

[1]See, e.g., R. H. Kennett, "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood," AJSLL, VI (1905), 161-86; T. J. Meek, "Aaron and the Sadocides," AJSLL, XLV (1928/29), 149-66; and F. S. North, "Aaron's Rise in Prestige," ZAW, LXVI (1954), 191-99, as well as the standard sources.

[2]Kaufmann, Religion, p. 197.

[3]Eichrodt, Theology, I, 393, sees this as "a title which . . . in the passage in question means no more than 'the priest.'" Hauret, "Evolution," p. 48 notes that "en Egypte . . . déjà le nom 'lévite' (Ex. 4,14) devint synonyme de zélateur de Dieu."

Gray[1] underscores the fact that the priesthood began at Sinai (Lev. 1:3-5; 4:5-7; 8:20-35) when Moses inaugurated the priestly activity and only on the eighth day did Aaron begin it (Lev. 9:7ff).

The Aaronite priests are chosen by covenant with them "in order to preserve 'for all time' an immediate relationship of trust and special position that could not be challenged (Num. 25:10-13)."[2] Yet the tradition, strong as it is at this point, moves quickly to the episode of the golden calf (Exod. 32) and the tribal Levites move to the fore. Eichrodt's comment that "Moses' call of the Levites is patently presented as in opposition to the established priesthood represented by Aaron"[3] may be too strong, even in the light of the golden calf experience. Kaufmann's evaluation appears to give a better account of the whole Pentateuchal account of the priesthood. "The golden calf episode makes the transformation of the secular warrior tribe of Levi into militant defenders of the new faith."[4] Aaron, in spite of his sin, still remains as "the Priest" even though the Levites move to a more prominent role than previously.

---

[1]Gray, Sacrifice, p. 195.

[2]Kraus, Worship, p. 94.

[3]Eichrodt, Theology, I, 394.

[4]Kaufmann, Religion, p. 198.

2. The Former Prophets

In the early history of Israel in Canaan Levites and the priests are portrayed as carrying out the roles already delineated in the Pentateuch.

i. Non-levitical priests

In the former prophets, three categories of non-levitical cultic functionaries appear. The privilege of sacrifice, from the earliest times permitted to the head of the household, remains the right of those who are not Levites. In Judg. 6:25ff, Gideon, a Manassehite, offers sacrifice to call Israel together against the Midianites. Manoah, a Danite (Judg. 13), at the urging of the visiting angel of the Lord, prepares a burnt-offering. Samuel's father Elkanah, an Ephraimite, comes regularly to the Shiloh sanctuary where the Levites were the cult officers and offers sacrifice (I Sam. 1:1-3). Indeed, Samuel himself functions as a member of the altar personnel at Shiloh.[1] Elijah (I Kings 18:30ff) also assumes the right to offer sacrifice in the Carmel contest with the Baal prophets.[2]

---

[1]The role of Samuel is complicated by the use in I Sam. 2:11 and 3:1 of the phrase "priest's servant" rather than "priest." The combination is נער הכהן. Cody, p. 74, notes that na'ar is used in the Phoenician temple accounts from Kition as a "terminus technicus for a subordinate temple servant."

[2]His tribal connection is unclear, for Gilead, the trans-Jordan territory was occupied by three groups, and the town of Tishbeh placed in the Manasseh territory. In any

In other areas than sacrifice there is evidence of non-levites participating in events elsewhere designated for the Levites. In I Sam. 7:1, Eleazar, son of Abinadab, is consecrated "to have charge of the ark of the Lord,"[1] and in II Sam. 6:3, two other sons, Uzzah and Ahio, function in the role of the levitical porters to oversee the moving arrangements. The story of Uzzah's death does not specifically state that that happened because he was not a Levite, but the author of II Samuel does record the episode of Uzzah's attempting to steady the ark by touching it as the cause.

Three times specific non-levitical men are identified as priests. In II Sam. 8:18, David's sons are priests; in II Sam. 20:26, one Ira, the Jairite, serves as David's priest.[2] Then in I Kings 4:5 Zabud, the son of Nathan, is identified as a priest.[3] These are non-levitical, yet they appear to function as priests. As Meek indicates, these "are nowhere called Levites, as would be the case if the

---

event, there is no evidence for a Levitic line for Elijah.

[1]Cody, p. 81, states "his priesthood is implied in the use of the verb qiddēš for the act of establishing him in his function."

[2]The Peshitto here reads "of Jattir," i.e., one of the Levitical cities, but there seems to be no good reason to accept this easier reading over the MT.

[3]LXX^{B,L} and the Old Latin Legionensis (tenth century A.D.) omit "priest," but as above, the more difficult reading is preferred.

term denoted official rather than tribal status."[1] The right of free men to offer sacrifice had always been a part of the Israelite tradition,[2] even though there was a priest present.

ii. Micah's Levite

The question of the early priesthood at Dan is a vexing one. According to Judg. 18:30, "Jonathan the son of Gershom, son of Moses, and his sons were priests to the tribe of the Danites until the day of the captivity of the land." The reading "Moses" is based on the versions, specifically the LXX, the Old Latin^{L}, the Vulgate, and the Syriac hexapla. The MT reads "Manasseh." The reading in the versions is understandable for several reasons: (a) in the light of the usual levitical line that takes precedence in the Old Testament; (b) in the immediate context of this verse, it is the abduction of Micah's Levite to serve as priest to the Danites;[3] (c) the naming of Gershom as an ancestor of the line. Moses' eldest son was Gershom (Exod. 2:

---

[1]Meek, "Origins," AJSLL (1921), p. 113.

[2]So Saul, I Sam. 14:34, builds an altar to Yahweh even though the account does not record his actual sacrificing on it. See Kraus, Worship, p. 93, and Cody, p. 72.

[3]Meek, "Origin," AJSLL (1921), 115, sees the Judges 17 "levite" as "a young man from Bethlehem of Judah, of the clan of Judah" and a stranger גר in Ephraim--i.e., a stranger enjoying certain rights of hospitality and protection while living with an alien tribe (Judg. 17:7; cf. also Judg. 19:1). "To interpret 'Levite' here as meaning a profession and not a tribe . . . is to violate the plain meaning of the text and is out of accord with references to Levi elsewhere."

22; 18:3), and his sons were reckoned to be Levites by the Chronicler (I Chron. 23:14-15).

However, the reading of the MT demands serious consideration.[1] The very emphasis on Levitical priesthood elsewhere makes it difficult to assume a deliberate or even accidental change in so important a name any time after the post-exilic period when the whole tone of the passage is anti-(northern) Israel. There is no evidence in the larger story (chapters 17-18) either of the Levite's name or of his marital status. Certainly the argument from silence cannot be considered conclusive, but neither can the sudden introduction of names and descendents be taken as proof that there is clear reference to the same individual. There is, then, a possibility that the Danite priesthood was non-Levitical.

Such a possibility may have given Jeroboam grounds for his exclusion of the Levitical priesthood from his new sanctuary at Bethel.[2] Kraus draws on I Kings 12:31 as evidence that Jeroboam "deliberately excluded the Levites. כהנים were appointed who were familiar with the ritual of a Canaanite sanctuary and whose duty it was to offer worship

---

[1]But cf. Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, pp. 196-98.

[2]Kraus, Worship, p. 151, states that ". . . Shechem was not considered when the official sanctuary Bethel was chosen, because an influential Levitical priesthood was established there which would not have been sympathetic to the efforts of the king."

before the calf image."[1] Dan was also one of Jeroboam's official sanctuaries where the calf was set up (I Kings 12: 25-31), and in the light of the idolatrous worship already established there, the case for the non-Levitical priesthood at that site both before and after Jeroboam's removal of the Levites from service at his shrines is measurably strengthened.[2]

iii. The Levites

There are only thirty-one references to the Levites in the Former Prophets, yet, as in the Pentateuch, they play a primary role in the cultic service. Eight of these references are to Micah's Levite discussed above, and two concern the Levite whose concubine/wife was raped and murdered by the men of Gibeah (Judg. 19-20). It is from the remaining twenty-one that the role of the Levites can be defined.

The primary references to the territorial divisions in Josh. 13-14 give only the indication that the Levites are

---

[1] Ibid., p. 98.

[2] Jeroboam's action displays a curious mixture of Israelite and Canaanite practices. Cody, p. 102, points out that כהן in the Old Testament prior to the late monarchy is used of the function of being a priest to someone (e.g., Micah, David, etc.), and only once (I Sam. 1:3) is it used of being priest to a deity. In the Canaanite civilization, the priest is always priest to a deity, never to a person. Micah's Levite became priest to the tribe (Judg. 18:19, 30), and to the image at Dan. Jeroboam appointed non-Levites to be "priests of the high places" (I Kings 12:32; 13:33). The invention of a new festival in the eighth month is another mark of the rejection of the levitical cult and the views associated with it.

not to have an inheritance of property for "God is their inheritance" (13:33). A straightforward reading of Josh. 18:7, "the Levites have no portion among you, for the priesthood of the Lord is their heritage," sets this in its proper perspective.

In Josh. 21, the cities are assigned from the tribal territory according to the family units--the Kohathites (Aaron getting an equal share with the rest of this clan), the Gershonites, and the Merarites--the same family branches as in the rest of the Old Testament.

Much of the remaining material is concerned with the responsibilities of caring for the ark of the covenant. In light of the Chronicler's treatment of Zadok, the reference in II Sam. 15:24 is important. At the time of Absalom's rebellion, David, with Zadok, Abiathar, and all the Levites brought the ark out of the city towards the wilderness. Then at David's order, Zadok and Abiathar carried the ark back to the city (II Sam. 15:25, 29). The Uzzah/Ahio story (II Sam. 6:1-8) indicates what befell non-Levites who handled the ark, and allowing some measure of consistency to the author (or redactor), the implication in the Zadok story is that he could legitimately carry the ark. This is indirect, but important evidence to support the later Chronicler's identification of Zadok as a Levite.[1]

---

[1]It has been suggested that Zadok and Abiathar did not touch the ark itself, but only the carrying-poles, where

Jeroboam's appointment of priests at Bethel and Dan is also relevant here, because they were both royal appointees and non-Levitical priests.[1]

Brief attention needs to be given to the Eliade line at Shiloh. The presence of authentic Egyptian names[2] in the genealogy indicates that there is a good possibility that there was a "genuinely Egyptian chapter in the history of

---

Uzzah had touched the ark proper. This is a valid possibility. But whatever the reason, and whether or not the episode is historically accurate, the Chronicler's view is that Zadok and Abiathar were successful because they were Levites. The Chronicler's identification of Zadok as a levite probably is based on II Sam. 8:17 where Zadok is listed as a son of Ahitub. But according to I Chron. 6:3-15, this line is from Eleazar, the son of Aaron. I Chron. 24:3 has Ahimelek as a descendent of Ithamar, son of Aaron. I Sam. 22:11 has Ahitub as father of Ahimelek. Apparently there were two "Ahitubs," one from each of the lines of Aaron. The question of the genealogies is discussed above, pp. 46-53. The point that Zadok could legitimately carry the ark is valid even without the Chronicler's explanation of Zadok's "levitical" background. That is, Samuel does not rule out the possibility that the Chronicler may be correct.

[1]I Kings 12:31. Kraus, p. 98, argues that the Levites had been scattered throughout the whole territory of Israel, and in fact, had "the support of the conservative, land-owning classes," and continued to function at the older Yahweh shrines such as Shechem and Gilgal, as well as in the country towns of Israel. Cf. von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy, p. 66, and Cody, p. 72.

[2]Cody, pp. 71-72, indicates that the Egyptian influence in Eli's lineage is clear. Hophni is paralleled in Egyptian by hfnr, a name which occurs only twice in the records. The Phinehas parallel, pz-nhsy, is frequent in the New Kingdom period. Cody argues that Hophni, especially, is a bad choice for a "typically Egyptian" name to attach to Eli's line, and therefore is probably an authentic family name that has a long family history. An author searching for a "typical" name to illustrate the ties to Egypt would probably select one that was both common and easily recognized as Egyptian if he was free to choose.

their family."[1] Cody argues that this material, supported by their continuing position as priests in the Shilonite sanctuary, "makes it easy to accept the tradition evident in 2:27 . . . that the priesthood of Shiloh was Levitical."[2]

The Former Prophets, like the Pentateuch, include little on the origin of the priesthood. The assumption in both places is that the priests were Levites, that is, members of the tribe of Levi.

3. The Latter Prophets

The situation is much the same in the Latter Prophets where there are numerous references to the priests. There is the well-known controversy between the priests and the prophets on the issue of the responsibility of those who are cultically oriented and ritually pure to do more than merely give lip-service to the claims of righteousness and justice. Yet, even here, the idea of the priesthood as such is not attacked, only the prostitution of the concept. The prophets are committed to the fact and obligations of divine choice in the life of the nation and its priesthood. The prophets deal extensively with the power and privilege (as well as the responsibility) of the priesthood, but have no specific material on the origin of the priesthood except the following. Isaiah 61:6 and 66:21 hint at the fact of a chosen priest-

---

[1] Ibid. [2] Ibid.

hood with the reference to the remnant which "shall be called the priests of the Lord" and the promise is made that Yahweh "will take some of them for priests and Levites." Beyond this, no detail is given.

Ezekiel makes a sharp distinction between the sons of Zadok "who above any of the sons of Levi may come near to the Lord to minister to him" (Ezek. 40:46), but he consistently sees these as Levites, true "Levitical priests of the sons of Zadok." Clearly defined areas of responsibility are spelled out, but there is no suggestion of a non-Levitical priesthood--all the Zadokites are Levites.[1]

The single most important item on the origin of the priesthood in the prophets is the material on the covenant with Levi. It is in the post-exilic work of Malachi that this issue is raised.[2] With his obvious interest in the temple cultus, Malachi precipitates questions by his failure to distinguish between priests and Levites, and by his references to Yahweh's covenant with Levi (Mal. 2:4, 8). Even

---

[1]A considerable body of literature is available on the question of Zadok. In addition to the material presented below, pp. 135-41, see Welch, PEJ, pp. 232-36; Cody, pp. 166-68; Kraus, p. 98; and F. S. North, ZAW, LXVI (1954), 191-99. Cf. Cross, B.A., XXVI (1963), 121; A. Kaufmann, Religion, pp. 432-46.

[2]Much of the material in the remainder of this subsection is drawn from a research paper A Study of the Theology of Malachi by G. Lloyd Carr, presented to the faculty of Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Virginia, 1966, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Theology, pp. 54-56.

though he is writing long after Ezekiel, he seems to be totally unaware that the Levites have been relegated to lesser duties. He acknowledges that the Levites need purification before they can offer acceptable sacrifices; at the same time he is aware that they will be the firstfruits of the purified nation so that they in turn can bring the blessings of Yahweh upon the whole nation.

There is no place in the Old Testament where the "covenant with Levi" is clearly defined. Malachi obviously follows the Deuteronomic practice of making no distinction between priests and Levites. But even Deuteronomy provides little direct evidence for a distinctive covenant with Levi. Deut. 18:1-8 includes a statement regarding the portion the Levites are to have no matter what town they are from. Then in Deut. 33:8-10, part of the poetic "blessing of Moses," it is recorded,

> and of Levi he said, . . . thy godly one whom thou didst test at Massah, . . . they observed thy work and kept thy covenant. They shall teach Jacob thy ordinances, and Israel thy law; they shall put incense before thee, and whole burnt offering upon thy altar.

But even this is no evidence of a special covenant with Levi, for in the prose parallel in Exod. 32:25-29, the covenant which Levi kept was the covenant which Moses brought from Yahweh for all the nation. Only Levi's sons repudiated the golden calf and swore allegiance to Yahweh.

In Num. 25:10-13, Aaron's grandson Phinehas receives

Yahweh's "covenant of peace" upon himself and his descendants, "the covenant of a perpetual priesthood." Even though this passage is usually classified as a part of the late P document,[1] it is not really in conflict with the statement of Jer. 33:17-22, for since Aaron was a Levite, his grandson certainly was also. The perpetual nature of the Davidic covenant is parallel to the covenant with day and night, and will last just as long. It is in this passage that the perpetual function of the Levites as those who stand before God to render cultic service is also linked with the Davidic covenant.[2]

Whether or not Malachi identifies the covenant with Levi and these passages is impossible to ascertain absolutely.[3] However, it can be safely said that there are definite parallels between them both as regards the nature of the covenant (life and peace), and its duration. Even though the priests/Levites have broken the covenant, it is a covenant

---

[1]E.g., Eissfeldt, p. 189.

[2]See John Bright, Jeremiah, Vol. XXI of The Anchor Bible (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965), pp. 293-97. Verse 21 does not specify a "covenant" here, but it is clearly intended in the parallel, and most recent commentators insert it. See also Sheldon H. Blank, "The Dissident Laity in Early Judaism," Hebrew Union College Annual, XIX (1945-46), 33-36 for an examination of this passage from a different point of view. The article by R. Abba, "Priests and Levites," IDB, III, 876-89 also has much of value on this.

[3]Neh. 13:29, the only other passage which speaks in this vein, is likewise ambiguous.

of חסד and will be kept by the purified tribe.[1]

4. The Writings

Apart from the work of the Chronicler, mention of the priesthood is almost non-existent in the Writings. Esther, with the apologia for the feast of Purim, totally ignores the priesthood. Job 1:5 indicates that the old tradition that the head of the family was eligible to serve as priest was still known, even if not practiced in the post-exilic period. Then, in Job 42:8 the three friends are instructed to offer sacrifice and beseech Job to intercede for them. He functions as priest for them.

The book of Psalms does not concern itself with the origin of the priesthood, but the superscriptions of the psalms themselves suggest that there was an established link between the cultic officers and the use of the Psalms in the cult. The whole question of the value of these superscriptions is extremely complex, and lies outside the scope of this dissertation, but a brief paragraph summarizing the basic issue is in order.

Most scholars favor the view that the superscrip-

---

[1]Eichrodt, Theology, I, 65, comments, "The experiences of the Jewish congregation that a priesthood conscious of the dignity of its calling was essential to a full communal life raises the divine promise to Levi out of its private and limited context and makes it yet another instance of the concern of the covenant God for his whole people."

tions do not form part of the original text or compilation, but were added at some time after the collection had been made. All but thirty-four of the Psalms have at least one of the five types of superscription attached. These titles preserve traditional authors or compilers, historical situations in David's life out of which particular psalms grew, identifications of literary forms, technical musical instructions, and liturgical instructions for the use of the psalm on specific occasions.[1] Many of these superscriptions are obviously very ancient, for the precise technical meaning of the expressions is often impossible to discern. That this situation existed as far back as the time of the LXX is indicated in the fact that even that version could only transliterate, not translate, many of the titles. While these titles and superscriptions do not indicate anything about the origin of the priesthood, they do indicate that traditionally many of the Psalms were associated with the musicians' guilds known from the Chronicler, and do provide another bit of evidence for the ancient tradition which associated the Korahites, Asaph, Heman, and David with the temple cultus.

Three brief texts in the Psalms (apart from the

---

[1]These superscriptions are discussed more fully in Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 641-44, Eissfeldt, Introduction, pp. 451-54, in Artur Weiser, The Psalms (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962), and in several journal articles. See the bibliographies in Pfeiffer, Eissfeldt, Weiser, and Young for further material. See below, pp. 147-49.

superscriptions give hints regarding the priesthood. Psalm 132:9, 16 place the priests and David in close relationship. Psalm 110:4 mentions the priesthood of Melchizedek, and Psalm 99:6 identifies Moses and Aaron as priests. None of these references gives much help except to suggest the fact that the writer was aware of an ongoing priestly tradition. The hints are so few, however, that it is impossible to construct any picture of the priesthood from the writings. Apart from an already well-known tradition, these few notes would be meaningless.

In summary, the tradition in the whole of the Old Testament from the Pentateuch to the Writings (excluding the Chronicler) is that the Israelite priesthood took its formal shape under Moses and Aaron during the wilderness experience, and that the tribe of Levi constituted the priestly family. Non-Levitical priests continued to function occasionally until the time of David, but the pattern of Levitical priesthood was the norm. During the prophetic period and the restoration, the witness of the documents points towards the same conclusion. The Pentateuch explains the origin of the priesthood and the other traditions take the explanation at face value.

CHAPTER IV

THE CONCEPT OF THE PRIESTHOOD IN THE CHRONICLER

The Chronicler portrays a highly organized priesthood, with various orders, and with various duties and responsibilities delegated to specific groups within the priesthood. He argues that these have an historical origin, in some cases going back to the Davidic/Solomonic period, and in other cases going back to the days of Moses. This chapter will be devoted to an examination of the Chronicler's concept of the orders and origins of the priesthood.

1. The Orders of the Priesthood

The Hebrew cult revolved around the idea of sacrifice and altar, and, as North points out, "in order that the will of God be done, it is important that the right people be in charge."[1] Part of the Chronicler's task was to identify the "right people" for the right jobs. To this end he recognizes two categories of cultic functionaries, the Priests, and the Levites.[2]

---

[1]Robert North, "The Theology of the Chronicler," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII (1963), 369.

[2]This two-fold division is not unique to Israel. E.g., in the administrative lists from Ugarit (Gordon, UH, 113, 114, 115, 300, 301, 303), reference is made to priests khnm and consecrated persons qdšm. These latter are

i. The Priests

The first of these categories relates to those who have been identified as the cultic officers in the general sense.[1] In the Chronicler, there are several distinct groupings of the "priests."

(1) Priests--Well over 100 times in the work of the Chronicler mention is made of the priests כהנים. I Chron. 9:13 describes them as "very able men for the work of the service of the house of God." This is in keeping with the

---

apparently cultic personnel. Possibly several of the groups mentioned in those texts may be purely secular (e.g., the nsk ksp, silver casters; mkrm, merchants; yṣrm, potters; kbṣm, launderers; pslm, sculptors; and yṣḥm, vestment makers), although the known temple-monopolies of many of these functions in the ancient Near East may indicate that these, too, were under the jurisdiction of the temple personnel. Of much more direct importance for the current topic is the naming of several groups of families who were granted state lands and support by virtue of these occupations. These are obviously cultic functionaries: šrm, singers; nqd, augurers; ʿšrm, butlers who served the ceremonial meals (ʿšr); mdm, 'measurers' who may have been a guild of temple surveyors/architects, or more simply the custodians of the weights and measures; mkṣm, slaughterers; ytnm, temple servants (Heb. נתנים. See below, pp. 158-59.) Others who also apparently were cultic functionaries but who did not share in the land grants were the tnnm, a special group of singers who sang antiphonal chants, possibly a sub-group of the šrm; the trrm, observers of (sacrificial) entrails and/or stars; and the ʾenšt, cult prostitutes. All of these groups appear to be classified as qdsm which would then be a general title. It is of interest that these parallel many of the groups in the Israelite cult, but there is no evidence at Ugarit of a classification called "Levites" (see above, pp. 99-101). For more detailed discussion on these points see John Gray, The Legacy of Canaan, Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, Vol. V (2nd ed.; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1965), pp. 209-17.

[1] See above, pp. 94.

general northwest Semitic background for the title כהן.[1]

The Chronicler, for the most part, assumes that the priests are the primary functionaries in the sacrificial system in the temple without going into much specific detail.[2]

There is some evidence of orders within the general body of priests, frequently on the basis of ancestry within the larger clan. In II Chron. 5:11 the comment is made, "All the priests who were present had sanctified themselves, without regard to their divisions." I Chron. 24 mentions the twenty-four "divisions" chosen by lot from the larger number of the sons of Aaron who "had as their appointed duty to come into the house of the Lord according to the procedure established for them by Aaron their father."[3]

Reference is made in II Chron. 36:14, Ezra 8:24, and 10:5 to "the leading priests" כָּל-שָׂרֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים. No detail is given about them except that they numbered more than a dozen

---

[1]There is a rather extensive literature on this point. See Cody, pp. 11-29 and de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 345-56, for two recent treatments of the questions. Cf. above, pp. 93-97.

[2]See, e.g., de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 348-57 for a summary description of their duties.

[3]On this, see Paul Winter, "Twenty-six priestly courses," Vetus Testamentum, VI (1956), 215-17, and Annie Jaubert, "Le Calendrier des Jubilés," Vetus Testamentum, VII (1957), 35-61. The increase from twenty-four to twenty-six courses at Qumran probably reflects the shift from a lunar to a solar calendar. This whole area is of importance for New Testament studies, but not of particular relevance here, except as it suggests a date for this section of Chronicles earlier than the Qumran period.

(Ezra 8:24 "twelve of the leading priests"), and that they had betrayed their priestly responsibilities. Ezra required of them an oath of purity in his reform movement.

(2) The Priest--The mention of the leading priests indicates that the Israelite priesthood is no exception to the principle that some sort of heirarchy is to be expected in any organization.[1] Thus, there is one individual who functions as the leader of the priests. He is identified by various titles, the most common of which is simply "the priest" הכהן.[2] At least seven individuals are so identified

---

[1]There are two Ugaritic texts (Gordon 18:1 and 62:54) which make reference to rb khnm, i.e., some sort of "chief priest." He suggests that this indicates some sort of structured organization of the clergy. In the first of these texts, the high priest is the addressee of a letter. In the second, the high priest is identified by name (Atnprln) and called rb nqdm "chief of the herdsmen." J. Gray, Legacy[2], p. 213, suggests that this title has some special sacral significance. Two possibilities suggest themselves: either the chief of the shepherds who cared for the temple (sacrifical) animals, or perhaps a foreshadowing of the "pastor" title of the leader of the leaders of the people.

[2]In I Chron. 6:10 (MT 5:36), Johanan, son of Azariah, is identified as "he who served as priest כֹּהֵן in the house Solomon built in Jerusalem" and in I Chron. 29:22 the writer lists Zadok as the one who was anointed "as Priest" לְכֹהֵן when Solomon was publicly anointed as king and "prince for the Lord." Both of these instances seem to be references to the same function "the priest" filled.

Some question has been raised regarding the naming of two individuals to the same office, but two alternatives are usually offered in explanation. Slotki, Chron., p. 31, notes that many commentators (Jewish), see the reference to Azariah to be to the Azariah who in II Chron. 26:17 opposed Uzziah's attempts to offer incense on the altar in the sanctuary. This is a distinct possibility, although the references to "the house Solomon built in Jerusalem" would seem

in the Chronicler: Zadok (I Chron. 16:39), Jehoiadah (I Chron. 27:5, II Chron. 22:11; 23:8, 9, 14; 24:2, 20, 25), Azariah (II Chron. 26:17), Hilkiah (II Chron. 34:14, 18), Meremoth (Ezra 8:33), Eliashib (Neh. 13:4), and Ezra (Ezra 7:5, 11; 10:10, 16; Neh. 8:2, 9; 12:26). Twice in the Aramaic section, Ezra is identified as כהנא, the direct equivalent (Ezra 7:12, 21). In addition, an unnamed individual is called "the priest" in Neh. 10:38 (MT 10:39), and may be considered in the same category, since he is also "the son of Aaron."[1] An examination of these passages indicates that

---

to indicate an earlier rather than a later date. On the other hand, the Chronicler's concern with "correct order" could also be the idea underlying his appeal to the Solomonic construction and ordering as late as Uzziah's time.

The more usual explanation of these texts is that 6:10 is merely reflecting the comment in I Kings 4:2 that Azariah, the son of Zadok, was priest under Solomon. In this case, the Chronicler's account includes several generations of the sons of Levi, from Zadok through Azariah and his children.

Morgenstern, "A Chapter in the History of the High Priesthood," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, LV (1938), 4, argues that כהן as a verb means specifically "to function as high priest," rather than just the general idea "function as a priest."

[1]In Neh. 7:65, a decision regarding the admission to the priesthood of those who could not prove their genealogical ties is left "until a priest with Urim and Thummim should arise." This is obviously not the position of the incumbent high priest, even though traditionally he was the one who consulted the Urim and Thummim (Exod. 28:30; Lev. 8:8). Such a statement seems to reflect the knowledge of an ancient tradition regarding the role of "the priest" rather than being nothing more than a post-exilic invention. It has often been observed that there is no mention of this method of ascertaining the will of Yahweh from the time of the early monarchy until the post-exilic period, but that it was in use both before and after the prophetic period. The references to Ezra noted above, and the reference to

the one so identified is the leader of the priests. In Morgenstern's words, the priest is not to be identified as "the only priest in Jerusalem," but rather as "the only priest of his class."[1]

Both Hilkiah (II Chron. 34:9) and Eliashib (Neh. 3:1, 20; 13:28) are called "high priest" הכהן הגדול. The term is not very common, being used only nineteen times in the Old Testament--three times in the Hexateuch (Num. 35:25, 28, and Josh. 26:6), all without the article, and sixteen times in the rest of the Old Testament, including these four references in the Chronicler.[2] Since these texts are usually assigned to the P document, Cody is able to say that the title "high priest" is absent "in authentic pre-exilic usage."[3] De Vaux lists four pre-exilic texts (II Kings 12:11; 22:4, 8; 23:4) where the title is found, but notes that

> in the parallels to these texts 2 Ch 24:11 (= 2 K 12:11) has kohen harôsh ('the head priest'), 2 Ch 34:14, 18 (= 2 K 22:4, 8) has merely kohen and the Greek version of 2 K 23:4 also presumes the reading kohen. Thus all four references to the 'high priest' before

---

Shelemiah the priest (Neh. 13:13) may be taken only in the general sense rather than in the sense of the leading priest. In the case of Shelemiah this is probable.

[1]Morgenstern, AJSLL (1938), 4, n. 8.

[2]Morgenstern, ibid., especially pp. 1-11, examines each of these references, pointing out that the title does not appear in Ezek. 40-48, the one place where it would be expected.

[3]Cody, p. 103. Cf. also, Bartlett, JTS (1968), 12-13.

the exile seem to be late modifications.[1]

At first glance this seems reasonable, but it fails to account for the reference to Hilkiah who is called הכהן הגדול in both II Kings 22:4 and II Chron. 34:9. Here, apparently, is an instance where the title actually appeared in the older record. If this is valid, there is no reason to posit an editorial change in the other references. The case for the use of this term in the pre-exilic period is still open. What is evident is that the titles הכהן, הכהן הגדול and כהן הראש were used interchangeably at least as early as 621 B.C.[2]

Eliashib, called הכהן הגדול in Neh. 3:1, 20; 13:20, is in Neh. 13:4, called simply הכהן who was "appointed over the chambers of the house of God." Here some sort of supervisory work is apparently connected with the office.

The third title כהן הראש is also applied to two men called elsewhere simply הכהן, as well as to two others: Amariah (II Chron. 19:11), and an unnamed chief priest whose officer פָּקִיד (II Chron. 24:11) was to assist in emptying the offering-box in the temple.[3]

In Ezra 8:17, הראש is applied to one Iddo, who is

---

[1] De Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 378.

[2] Morgenstern, p. 3, notes that the compound titles are never used of Aaron, his immediate descendants, or immediate successors. Eliezer and Phinehas are always הכהן.

[3] The reference in Ezra 7:5 probably is to be interpreted as "chief" הראש in the sense of "first in the line of priests" rather than as part of the title of the office he filled.

"the leading man at the place Casiphia." He apparently was the leader of a group of temple servants.[1] The inference seems to be that the title is similar to those discussed above, implying some sort of leadership position.[2]

A fourth term which is used in connection with this office is נגיד, translated variously as "ruler, prince, overseer"[3] or as "chief officer."[4] The noun, perhaps derived from the very common verb נגד "to be conspicuous," occurs twenty-two times in the MT of the Chronicler.[5] Most of these references are to the king, his generals, or to some sort of appointed civil servant,[6] but other individuals are

---

[1]So Morgenstern, AJSLL, p. 12. Cf. Bartlett, JTS, pp. 13-15 for further discussion of this point. He argues that there is no evidence of a hereditary high-priesthood implied in this word, but that it is used primarily "of one chosen and appointed for his abilities." If this is valid, there would seem to be evidence for the continuation of the old charismatic criteria for leadership.

[2]Bartlett, JTS, p. 12, n. 5, makes reference to the title "the anointed priest" in I Chron. 29:22. However, the text does not seem to bear out this as a title. The meaning seems to be that there is a method of installation to be used. The text reads that Solomon was "anointed unto the Lord to be prince and Zadok to be priest." וַיַּמְלִיכוּ שֵׁנִית לִשְׁלֹמֹה בֶּן-דָּוִיד וַיִּמְשְׁחוּ לַיהוָה לְנָגִיד וּלְצָדוֹק לְכֹהֵן.

[3]BDB, pp. 616-17. [4]So the R.S.V.

[5]Possibly the verb may be denominative. See John Waters, "The Political Development and Significance of the Shepherd-King Symbol in the Ancient Near East and in the Old Testament," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1970) for a treatment of the term and bibliography.

[6]David, I Chron. 5:2; 11:2; 17:7; 28:4. Solomon, I Chron. 29:22; II Chron. 6:5, Israelite generals, I Chron. 13:1; 27:4; II Chron. 11:22; 28:7. Sennacherib's commanders, II Chron. 32:21, civil servants, II Chron. 31:12; 26:16; 11:11; 35:8.

so identified. In II Chron. 31:12, Hezekiah's chief officer in charge of the collection is Conaiah "the Levite," and Azariah (v. 13) is identified as "the chief officer of the house of God." There is no explicit statement that Azariah is a Levite, although the immediate context would suggest that he probably was.

A few pages further on, in II Chron. 35:8, the "chief officer of the house of God" appears to be a civil servant under Josiah who was responsible for the provision of the sacrificial animals.

According to I Chron. 9:20, Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, was ruler over the gatekeepers "in times past," and in I Chron. 26:24 Shebuel the son of Gershon, the son of Moses, is identified as "chief officer in charge of the treasuries." The former is apparently of the Aaronide line, although he is portrayed as filling an office later designated to the "Levites," while the latter is in the broad category of Levitical descent as presented by the Chronicler.

I Chron. 12:27 (28) describes one of the Levites (?) who sided with David at Hebron as "the prince Jehoiada of the house of Aaron." He may have functioned as a priestly leader of David's army, but there is no evidence to support such a supposition.

At least twice (Neh. 11:11 and I Chron. 9:11) the "ruler of the house of God" is identified as a member of the "priests," but in II Chron. 19:11, a clear distinction is

made between Zebediah, the "governor of the house of Judah in all the king's matters," and Amariah as כהן הראש.

Thus, the evidence for the identification of the נגיד as the leading priest is ambiguous. Certainly, on occasion, the "ruler of the house of God" was a priest, and therefore by implication, the chief priest, but the term נגיד does not necessarily demand the concept of priesthood where it is used by the Chronicler. This ambiguity may reflect the Chronicler's care in reproducing his sources, which were themselves ambiguous in their use of נגיד.

(3) Sons of Aaron--The genealogical lists in I Chron. 6 (MT 5:27-6:66) give the names of those who were considered to be near descendants of Aaron.[1] There is no problem here except the inclusion of Zadok as a son of Aaron.[2] It was these who were charged with the original responsibility for making "offerings upon the altar of burnt offering and upon the altar of incense for all the work of the most holy place and to make atonement for Israel" (I Chron. 6:49; MT 6:34). The Chronicler treats this obligation as falling on the descendants of Aaron as well. "Aaron was set apart to consecrate the most holy things that he and his sons should burn incense before the Lord and minister to him and

---

[1]See above, pp. 49-53.

[2]See below, pp. 135-41. On the question of the Aaron/Kohath line, see below, pp. 147-49.

pronounce blessings in his name forever" (I Chron. 23:13). On this basis, the Chronicler identifies the priests as "the sons of Aaron." Since they fulfill the same function--serving at the altar of incense--there is little doubt that the Chronicler used the two titles interchangeably.[1]

---

[1]In I Chron. 15:4; 23:28, 32; 24:1-5, 19, 31, the priests, although not identified as כהנים, are called the "sons of Aaron." It is only in II Chron. 13:9-10; 26:18; 29:21; 31:19; 35:14 that the two terms כהנים and בני-אהרן are used. Such a distinction may reflect the Chronicler's theological perspective in the post-exilic period, but it may also reflect his care and accuracy in his use of his source materials. If the Zadokite line was in the ascendancy during the late monarchy, the identification of the priests as Aaronides by the court historians may be an attempt to safeguard the older tradition. However, no certain conclusion is possible here, for none of these references is found in the Samuel-Kings parallels.

R. H. Kennett, in "Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood," Journal of Theological Studies, VI (1905), pp. 11-15 raises the issue of the genealogies in I Chron. 6:13-15, claiming that the list here is a deliberate attempt to make Jehozadak an Aaronide and therefore to legitimate in the south the line of priests which he maintains were originally the priests of the Israelite sanctuary at Bethel. However, as Myers points out (I Chron., p. 45), the list is repeated (except for the six generations Amariah to Johanan), in Ezra 7:1-6 except that in the Ezra list Ezra himself replaces Jehozadak. This need not indicate arbitrary substitution on the part of the editor of the Ezra list, for in the light of the other known omissions (the six names from Meraioth to Azariah and the omission of Azariah the son of Hilkiah), and the time gap from the time of the restoration to the time of Ezra, such differences in the list are understandable. Selective genealogical lists are the rule rather than the exception. Further, there is no need to argue for arbitrary padding on the part of the Chronicles list, for as indicated above, pp. 23-25, the practice of paponymy was well established in the ancient world and easily explains the duplication of the Amariah/Ahitub/Zadok cycle of generations. Cf. J. R. Bartlett, JTS (1968), 1-7 for further discussion although Bartlett concludes that the additions are the Chronicler's own composition.

The reference in I Chron. 12:27 to "the prince Jehoiada of the house of Aaron" יהודע הנגיד לאהרן (see above,

(4) The House of Zadok--A much more serious and difficult problem is the role of Zadok and the "house of Zadok"[1] in the structure of the Israelite priesthood.[2] According to I Sam. 22:20-23, Abiathar was the only priestly survivor of Saul's massacre in Nob, and as a result of that event, he cast his lot with David. Apparently of the Levitical line through Eli (I Sam. 14:3; I Kings 2:27), he served David in the care of the Ark and in the establishment of the cult center at Jerusalem. At this point Zadok is introduced, and takes pre-eminence, finally becoming "the sole holder of the priestly office (I K 2:35),"[3] after Solomon removes Abiathar to Anathoth for his support of Adonijah, Solomon's rival to the throne. Zadok's support for Solomon may have resulted from the fact that Solomon was Jerusalem-born while Abiathar supported the Hebron-born Adonijah and thus proclaimed his loyalty to the older alliances of David. In any event, the lines are drawn.

Rowley rightfully raises the issue of Abiathar's long

---

pp. 131-133), gives no indication he was an active priest, nor does it rule out the possibility.

[1]II Chron. 31:10 is the only reference to the "house of Zadok" בית-צדוק. H. H. Rowley, "Zadok and Nehushtan," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVIII (1939), 113-41, especially pp. 130-31, suggests that Zedek "may have been the name of a Semitic deity."

[2]See, e.g., de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 372-76 and Kraus, Worship, pp. 99-100. Cody, pp. 88-93 discusses the issue in the context of the relationship between Abiathar and Zadok.

[3]De Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 373.

and devoted service to David and notes that "David is not likely to have elevated a mere nobody to equal status with him without some compelling reason," but there is no record of Zadok's having "rendered any special service to David prior to his appearance beside Abiathar."[1] Nevertheless, he was given prime place, and the Zadokites remained legitimate priests in Jerusalem at least until the exile.

It is widely held that Zadok was an outsider whom David appointed to pacify the Jerusalemite population after his capture of the city.[2] The theory is that Zadok was the resident priest at the Jebusite sanctuary in Jerusalem, and therefore is the heir of Melchizedek. De Vaux, while recognizing the attractiveness of this hypothesis, is careful to note:

> If we hesitate to adopt this solution it is for lack of positive evidence. First, it implies that a sanctuary of El-'Elyon was later used for the cult of Yahweh, and the texts never once mention any such sanctuary; the Ark was kept in a Tent until the end of David's reign. Secondly, Sadoq is never mentioned in the Bible except in connection with the Ark and

---

[1] Rowley, JBL (1939), 118.

[2] Cf. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 374. For a full discussion see H. H. Rowley, "Melchizedek and Zadok," Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950), pp. 461-72, and Rowley, JBL (1939), 113-41. In this latter article, Rowley argues that the continuation of the Jebusite population in Jerusalem made it essential that David move to pacify the Jebusites by retaining Zadok and the Jebusite priesthood while adding Abiathar as the Yahweh priest. But this is the sort of compromise that the Old Testament prophets and the Chronicler see as an abomination. How could David, of all people, do this sort of thing?

the Tent of Yahweh.[1]

De Vaux also suggests that the lack of Jebusite cultic practices in the Yahweh worship in Jerusalem also tends to negate this position.

Other suggestions have been made. Auerbach[2] argues, on the basis of I Chron. 10:39, that Zadok, originally the priest at the old Gibeonite sanctuary, gravitated to Jerusalem after the establishment of the new cult center there. However, the text seems to indicate that he was left at Gibeon <u>after</u> the transfer of the Ark to Jerusalem.[3]

Wellhausen[4] suggests pointing the MT of II Sam. 6:3 אַחְיו Ahijo, a proper name, as אָחִיו "his (unnamed) brother," and conjectures that Uzzah's brother is really Zadok. Several scholars have picked up this suggestion, but there is, in Cody's words, "no positive evidence in its support."[5] Two serious questions arise and remain unanswered: "Why Zadok is not called the son of Abinadab in 2 Sa 8:17 and thus given

---

[1]De Vaux, <u>Ancient Israel</u>, p. 374.

[2]E. Auerbach, "Die Herkunft der Sadokiden," <u>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft</u>, XLIX (1931), 327-28. Cf. Welch, <u>Work</u>, pp. 30-33.

[3]W. L. Reed, "Gibeon," Thomas, (ed.) <u>Archeology and Old Testament Study</u>, p. 240, notes that excavations at el-Jîb have revealed an important Davidic/Solomonic city, but "no trace of the cultic installations that can be linked with these events."

[4]Julius Wellhausen, <u>Der Text der Bücher Samuelis</u> (Gottingen: Vandenhoech & Ruprecht, 1871), p. 167.

[5]Cody, p. 90.

his rightful ancestry," and ". . . why Uzzah should be named in 2 Sa 6:3f while Zadok remains anonymously 'his brother.'"[1] These are important questions that undercut Wellhausen's suggestion.

Rehm,[2] following Mohlenbrink,[3] argues that the Aaronic and Zadokite lines were late additions to the Levitic genealogies when Zadok, ca. 1000 B.C., adopted as his own the twelve generation line back to Eliezer/Eleazar ca. 1200 B.C. The core of his argument (p. 93) is that Zadok is of the line of Aaron,[4] while Eleazar is a descendant of Moses. Rehm, however, holds that Moses and Aaron were not brothers, and the Eleasarides were the pre-conquest Canaanite priests at Gibeah.

> The genealogies in I Chronicles are ultimately correct in connecting Zadok with the line of Aaron and the explanation for a lack of proper genealogy for Zadok in pre-exilic texts would be the discredibility of the line of Aaron that we have posited during the Tribal League as a result of unsuccessful skirmishes with the powerful Mushite line.[5]

On the other hand, the biblical record makes Zadok a descendant of Aaron through Eleazar (I Chron. 6:2-13, MT 5:29-37 and 6:50-53, MT vv. 35-38). De Vaux draws atten-

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Merlin Dale Rehm, "Studies."

[3] Kurt Mohlenbrink, "Die levitischen Überlieferungen des Alten Testaments," ZAW, LII (1934), 184-231.

[4] Cf. Albright, ARI, p. 110.

[5] Rehm, "Studies," p. 244.

tion to the reference in II Sam. 8:17 and suggests that the apparent transposition of the names of Abiathar and Ahimelech (assuming that Ahimelek did not have a son to whom he gave the name of his own father), leaves Zadok without any known genealogical links. He also interprets this passage as suggesting the possibility of a link with the line of Eli through Phinehas.[1] However, the only list that clearly links Zadok, Ahitub and Eli is in the apocryphal II Esdras 1:1-3 from about the middle of the second century A.D.[2] and may safely be disregarded. De Vaux acknowledges that "possibly he [Zadok] really was of Levitical origin, though not from the same branch as the house of Eli, and the later tradition of the Chronicler may rest on a firm basis."[3]

Rowley, on the other hand, argues that it was necessary for the Chronicler to attribute Aaronic ancestry to Zadok in order to legitimate the fact of Zadokite presence in the priesthood in a time when the P document was the final authority in priestly practice.[4] He states,

> That the Zadokites were connected by blood with the old secular tribe of Levi I hold very improbable, but that in virtue of their calling they were named Levites, in the vocational sense of that word prior

---

[1]He observes that II Kings 2:27, I Sam. 2:27-36; 3:11-14 rule this out since Zadok's succession in these is interpreted as a repudiation of the house of Eli, p. 373.

[2]So Harrison, Introduction, p. 1201.

[3]De Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 374.

[4]Rowley, JBL, p. 115.

to the date of Deuteronomy, I think almost certain."[1] But, why bother with an Aaronide ancestry if "levitical" links were all that were required? Further, Rowley's suggestion that Zadok is of the line of Melchizedek also tends to downgrade the need for an Aaronite or Levitical ancestry, since the Melchizedek priesthood is guaranteed in perpetuity.[2]

Bartlett[3] suggests that Zadok's family did not really control the Jerusalem priesthood until after the Josian reform and that it is Ezekiel who assigns the name "the house of Zadok" to all the legitimate Levitical priests in Jerusalem who remained faithful to Yahweh in the time of Judah's crisis.[4] Thus he maintains that there was no "succession" of Zadokite descendants who functioned as high priests on the basis of a family-type dynasty. Rather, the "'chief priests' were appointed by the king as his temple administrators and cultic deputies."[5]

Cody, however, appears to have the evidence on his side when he states,

---

[1] Ibid., p. 117, but see above, pp. 97-108 on "Levites."

[2] Psalm 110:4. Cf. I Sam. 2:35 and Num. 25:13, fulfilled here.

[3] Bartlett, JTS (1968), 15-18.

[4] Ezekiel does not use this precise phrase, but he does refer to the "sons of Zadok" three times (40:46; 44:15; 48:11), and to the "seed of Zadok" in 43:19.

[5] Bartlett, JTS (1968), 18.

> . . . the attention given to Zadok in both early texts and late texts does show that throughout the monarchial period Zadok was recognized as the first in the succession of chief priests in Jerusalem, even though that succession may not have passed regularly from father to son. The king may well have designated the high priest (or at least have had a determining voice in his designation), and the priesthood may have included some who were not descendents of Zadok, but when the scraps of material on the Jerusalemite priesthood are put together, the resulting sketch suggests a self-perpetuating closed circle, with its members' own likes and dislikes constituting the criterion for admission, especially after the reigns of David and Solomon had passed and the Jerusalem priesthood was solidly established.[1]

At least for the Chronicler there is no question; Zadok is of the Levitical line through Aaron. The Chronicler gives no reasons for Zadok's appointment to the high priesthood, but simply assumes that it is common knowledge that Zadok and his family did, in fact, function in that role. With the Chronicler's demonstrated care in his use of his sources, and lacking any evidence to the contrary, de Vaux's comment that this tradition "may rest on a firm basis"[2] would seem to understate the case.

(5) Levitical Priests--A brief note at this point on the term "the Levitical Priests" is in order, without attempting to prejudge the material to be presented in subsection ii of this chapter.

The phrase הַכֹּהֲנִים הַלְוִיִּם, so characteristic of

---

[1]Cody, p. 93, n. 17a.

[2]De Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 374. See above pp. 116, n. 1, 117.

Deuteronomy,[1] occurs in I Chron. 9:2; II Chron. 5:5; 23:18; 30:27; Ezra 10:5; Neh. 10:35; 11:20. Cody notes that in all of these texts except II Chron. 5:5 there is the variant reading "the priest and the Levites," and argues on the basis of stylistic criteria[2] that the original ו has been dropped. He does comment, however, that there are instances where this has not taken place, and where the ו has been retained (e.g., II Chron. 30:27). This admission is crucial, and indicates that the proposed solution does not really solve the problem. If the criterion of the "harder reading" has any validity, the MT here is correct, for it is certainly "harder" to explain the omission in the MT than to explain its inclusion in the other witnesses. Since the MT of Chronicles is otherwise so careful to distinguish priests and Levites, this carelessness is inexplicable.[3]

(6) Other "Priests"--Finally, notice needs to be taken of the Chronicler's few references to those priests who were not priests of Yahweh. In II Chron. 13:9, specific mention is made of Jeroboam's priests who supplanted the

---

[1]Welch, PEJ, p. 207 comments that the Chronicler occasionally calls Levites by the Deuteronomic title "Levitical priests." "He brought the two together and linked the subjects in his record."

[2]Cody, p. 184, n. 28. He draws heavily here on A. Kropart, "Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, XVI (1909), 62-63.

[3]Cf. Welch, PEJ, pp. 208ff.

"priests of the Lord." The writer portrays these new priests as really non-priests of what are "no gods" and therefore as essentially useless.

One individual, Mattan, identified as a priest of Baal (II Chron. 23:17), was put to death as part of Jehoiadah's reform movement. Similarly, Josiah burnt the bones of the priests of Baal on their own altars during the early stages of his reform (II Chron. 34:5). It is evident on the basis of these references that simply to claim identification as one of the כהנים was not sufficient authority for access to the legitimate sanctuary. There is a distinct difference between those who are true כהנים and those who simply assume the role and title.

ii. The Levites

While the Chronicler's treatment of the priests is relatively simple, the crux of his interpretive role comes in his treatment of the Levites.[1] He assumes them to be descendants of Levi who by virtue of this identification, are eligible to share in the sanctuary service.[2] Liver summarizes the situation in these terms:

There is an explicit functional difference between

---

[1]On the origin of the terms Levi and Levite, see above, pp. 97-107.

[2]Welch, Work, pp. 17-18, picks up the suggestion that these were northern (Israelite) priests, as in Deuteronomy, who were accorded the right of temple service in the Restoration because of their faithfulness.

> priest and Levite, the priest being one who officiates in the temple or high place, while the Levite is merely one who belongs to a family which has the right and the qualifications to officiate as priest whether he be an itinerant Levite who supports himself by charity or be attached to one of the sanctuaries in a subordinate role.[1]

This appears to be the general perspective of the Old Testament, and for the Chronicler the "Levites" function in that subordinate role at the Jerusalem temple.[2] The Chronicler makes frequent reference to them and their activities, so that a fairly clear picture emerges of their work as he perceives it. On occasion he identifies them by families, sometimes in terms of their occupational groups, and frequently by a combination of both of these.

(1) The Sons of Levi--The general name, and by far the most frequent (about 170 times in Chron.-Ezra-Neh.), is the Levites הלוים or the sons of Levi בְּנֵי לֵוִי. The extensive genealogical lists in the first part of I Chronicles devote considerable space[3] to the sons of Levi, and even these are not complete.[4] Considerable discussion has been given to

---

[1]Liver, SH (1961), 209, n. 33.

[2]Cody, pp. 190-91, notes that in the post-exilic period, ". . . the priest is, as always, the attendant of the sanctuary. . . . 'Levite' in genealogical contexts retains a residual tribal sense, and includes the priests; in functional contexts it covers all the lesser ministrants of the Temple, distinct from the priests."

[3]Kittel, BH[3], I Chron. 6:1-81, MT 5:27-6:66.

[4]Myers, I Chron., pp. 46-48.

the validity of these lists but as has already been noted,[1] current scholarly opinion is generally inclined to recognize them as legitimate historical records.

For the Chronicler, at least, there is a family connection which he presents as the basis for the role of the Levites in the cult. It is from these lists of "Levites" that the priests are drawn.

At this distant point in time it is virtually impossible to arrive at complete genealogical order within the lists of names preserved in Chronicles, but certain clear groups are identified, and other groups appear and may be tentatively identified.[2]

The list of Levitical cities in Josh. 21:9-42 and I Chron. 6:54-81 (MT 6:39-66), is sometimes used to establish the groupings on a purely geographical basis, but, as Cody indicates,[3] there is no particular reason why groups of Kohathites, Gershonites, and Merarites should be classified as "Levitical" if the division is not "what it purports to be: a demographic subdivision within a larger tribal group."[4]

---

[1] Cf. above, pp. 46-53.

[2] Myers, II Chron., gives eighteen pages of genealogical charts for Chron.-Ezra-Neh. (pp. 233-50).

[3] Cody, pp. 160-62.

[4] Ibid. Cf. W. F. Albright, "The List of Levitic Cities," Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, Eng. Sec. (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1945), pp. 49-73.

(a) Sons of Gershom. Eleven times in the Chronicler, Levi's first son is called Gershom גֵּרְשֹׁם, גֵּרְשֹׁום. Twice, I Chron. 6:1; 23:6, Gershon, גֵּרְשׁוֹן, the spelling used elsewhere in the Old Testament is used.[1] A lengthy list of descendants is given, with particular attention given to one family, the sons of Asaph, within the larger family. These Asaphites had particular responsibilities as temple musicians.[2]

The Gershonites, traditionally, had been responsible for transporting the tabernacle, the tent coverings, hangings, and cords for the door, court, and gate during the years of the wilderness wanderings. According to I Chron. 15:7, they had played a part in bringing the Ark to

---

[1]Cody, p. 163, n. 46, discusses the arguments for seeing only these two passages as being pre-exilic, concluding that Rudolph's reason for the late date of the Gershom references can be used equally well for a pre-Chronicler date for these texts, and thus indicate a source he draws on. There are five references to the "Gershonnites" (I Chron. 23:7; 26:21 twice; 29:8; II Chron. 29:12), that appear to support Cody's arguments against Rudolph's.

[2]Twelve of the canonical Psalms (50, 73-83) are attributed to Asaph, 75, 76, 77, 80, 81, with musical directions. The whole group has a distinctive nationalistic outlook that includes both north and south (e.g., 77:15; 80:1; 81:4-5, etc.). The historical perspective is also evident in these Psalms. The way Yahweh worked with Israel from Sinai to the temple is the focus of Ps. 78, and similar references are found in 50; 74:12ff; 77:10ff; 80:8ff; 81:5ff; 83:9ff. The motif of Yahweh as the Shepherd of Israel is found in 74:1; 77:20; 78:52, 70-72; 79:13; 80:1. (A. F. Kirkpatrick, Psalms, Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges [Cambridge: University Publishers, 1901], 427-30). This may reflect the interests of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, but perhaps the close relationship between Asaph the musician and David the Shepherd-King better explains this.

Jerusalem. In I Chron. 29:8, mention is made of the duties imposed upon some of the Gershonites to care for the treasury and the jewels collected for the temple by David.

(b) Sons of Kohath. The second of Levi's sons, Kohath קְהָת, is also mentioned eleven times by the Chronicler. Again, there is a lengthy list of descendants. I Chron. 6:1-15 (MT 5:27-41) includes Aaron, Eliezer, Phinehas, and the chief priests as part of the Kohathite line, while the later compilation (I Chron. 6:16-30, MT 6:1-15) omits these key individuals and presents as Kohathites only less important persons. Cody argues, on this basis, that the sons of Aaron --the priests--were thought to be in the Kohathite line.[1]

In the wilderness period, the Kohathites were responsible for the tabernacle furniture and the vessels, those items which were the particular concern of the Aaronite priesthood. One branch of the Kohathites, the sons of Korah, functioned as gatekeepers in the tent (I Chron. 9:19), and in the temple (I Chron. 26:12-19).[2]

A question has also been raised regarding the family of the Kohathites, identified as the sons of Heman. In II

---

[1]Cody, p. 163. See above, p. 133.

[2]I Chron. 26:1 (MT) has Korah as קֹרַח-בְּנֵי אָסָף. The LXX has ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Ἀβιασαφ (LXX^{B} has Ἀβιασαφαρ). This presupposes a Hebrew text אביסף. I Chron. 9:19 has Ebiasaph and Kore in the father/son relationship in the line of Korah. The LXX, apparently, is harmonizing these two passages, keeping the Asaphite musicians distinct from the gatekeepers. Cf. Myers, I Chron., p. 174.

Chron. 5:12ff the groups is mentioned but no names are given. II Chron. 29:14 names Jehiel and Shimei. But in I Chron. 25: 4, fourteen "sons of Heman" are listed with the sons of Asaph and Jeduthun as musicians who shared in worship responsibilities. Here is the difficulty. Of the fourteen, the last nine are "for the most part improbable, or impossible, as names."[1] Consequently, as early as Ewald (1870), attempts were made to repoint and redivide the consonantal text to clarify the meaning. The most common solution has been to read the text as a stanza of a hymn, or possibly as a catalogue of hymns used by the Hemanite singers.[2] Although this is an interesting possibility, the fact that in vv. 13-31 the same fourteen names are repeated as names

---

[1]H. L. Ellison, "I and II Chronicles," The New Bible Commentary, ed. by F. Davidson, A. M. Stibbs, and E. F. Kevan (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1953), p. 351.

[2]Cf. Myers, I Chron., pp. 172-73, and Frank Michaeli, Les Livres des Chroniques, d'Esdras et de Néhémie, Vol. XVI of Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament (Neuchâtel, Switzerland: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1967), p. 125. Ellison, "I & II Chron.," pp. 351f, takes it as a hymn:

"Be gracious unto me, O Jah, be gracious unto me!
Thou art my God whom I magnify and exalt.
O my help when in trouble, I say,
Give an abundance of visions."

Myers, I Chron., p. 173, suggests the catalogue idea is better and translates:

"Be gracious to me Yahweh, be gracious to me;
My God art thou;
I have magnified and will exalt (my) helper
Sitting (in) adversity I said,
Clear signs give plentifully."

He goes on to point out parallels to the first three lines in the canonical Psalms, but that there are no known parallels to the last two lines.

of the leaders of the various groups who were to lead the musical services makes it obvious that the Chronicler understood these as proper names.[1]

(c) Sons of Merari. Levi's third son, Merari, is also portrayed by the Chronicler as being the father of some of the Levites. He is mentioned twenty times by the Chronicler, all but three of these appearing in I Chronicles. In the wilderness the Merarites were responsible for the transportation of the tabernacle frames (boards), bars, and sockets, and the court pillars, sockets, pins, and cords. By the time of David their duties included a share in the music of the service as well as working as porters.

One branch of the family, the sons of Jeduthun, were part of the musical group, but there is some confusion regarding their origin. It is commonly understood that Jeduthun is the same person as Ethan (I Chron. 6:42), and there is no apparent reason to reject this identification.

(2) The Guilds--As has been noticed in the treatment

---

[1]Of the fourteen, the debated nine are reproduced exactly in vv. 23-31, although not in the same order as in 4b. Of the other five, the first two are repeated exactly in vv. 13 and 16, but the third and the fifth show slight variants. V. 4 has עֻזִּיאֵל, v. 18 עֻזִּיאֵל; v. 4 שְׁכַנְיָאֵל, v. 20 שׁוּבָאֵל; v. 4 וִירִימוֹת, v. 22 יְרֵמוֹת[לְ]. These three, however, are not in the portion of v. 4 that is considered to be the poem.

of the Levitical families, no clear lines of distinction mark the duties of the individual families. Rather, there is an appearance of some sort of guild organization that draws membership from across family units.

The existence of trade and cult guilds in the ancient Near East is well documented. Albright's position on the Canaanite origin of musical guilds is held by many who see a common pattern supported by the Ugaritic studies.[1] Levine argues for an "actual historical relationship between the Ugaritic and the Israelite guilds."[2] He suggests that in both of these societies, cultic guilds are described with the formula "bn X" and that these are "identified in terms of (a) a patronymic, (b) a derivative place name or, (c) a skill by which the guild was known."[3] He also indicates that there is a close identification between the guild classifications in both Israelite and Ugaritic societies. The list in Ezra 7:7 parallels the Ugaritic guild lists with the exception that at Ugarit, there is the omission of any mention of a group (or guild) of Levites. He fails, however, to draw the apparent conclusion that the "Levites" are not a

---

[1]William Foxwell Albright, Archeology and the Religion of Israel (Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1942), pp. 125-29. See also Cyrus Gordon, Ugaritic Manual (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1955), 1385.

[2]Levine, JBL (1963), 211.

[3]Ibid., p. 212. Cf. Cyrus Gordon, The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilization (2nd ed.; New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1965), pp. 41-43.

guild at all, but that this is a peculiarly Hebrew family name.[1] The references in I Chron. 4:21-23 to the "Families of the house of linen workers at Bethashbea," and the "potters and inhabitants of Netaim and Gedarah; they dwelt there with the king for his work," are, according to v. 22, based on ancient records. In a similar vein I Chron. 8:40 identifies a guild of Israelite archers by the same name as that applied to a guild by Ugaritic archers.[2] The recent work at En-Gedi has revealed the existence of perfume guilds at that site during the time of Josiah.[3] Thus it is clear that the organization of craft guilds was not a new phenomenon in post-exilic Israel but rather was the continuation of a long tradition dating back at least into the second millennium B.C.[4] The Chronicler seems to treat the temple functionaries as guild members. And for the most part, these cult guilds were composed of members of the Levites, although in Ezra-Nehemiah this precise relationship is not always spelled out in detail. These groups were apparently assumed

---

[1] See above pp. 97-107, 134, n. 1.

[2] Levine, JBL (1963), 211, n. 18.

[3] B. Mazar, "En-Gedi," in Thomas, Arch. and Old Testament Study, pp. 223-30.

[4] J. Gray, Legacy[2], p. 216, commenting on the hereditary offices and guilds identified by family names, says "The Ras Shamra material . . . shows that such an establishment if not actually demonstrable in the case of the pre-exilic Temple in Jerusalem was at least not an absolute anachronism in Canaan."

to fall under the general heading, but not to the point of limiting the use of the term "Levites" to the totality of the collective groups.[1]

(a) Singers. There are over forty references in the Chronicler to the temple musicians הַמְשֹׁרְרִים (Ugaritic šrm).[2] The most detailed list is in I Chron. 15:16-24 where

[1]Only in Ezra 2:70 is there any serious question to be raised. The RSV, following I Esdras 5:46 reads, "The priests, the Levites, and some of the people lived in Jerusalem and its vicinity; and the singers, the gatekeepers, and the temple servants lived in their towns and all Israel in their towns." However the clause "lived in Jerusalem and its vicinity" is included neither in the MT nor the LXX. These words are found only in the I Esdras reference. Cook, in Charles, Apocrypha, I, p. 38, says confidently, "The MT has consequently altered the wording." But this is begging the question. The general consensus of opinion is that I Esdras was completed ca. 150 B.C., possibly in Alexandria (see, e.g., Harrison, Introduction, pp. 1196-97). If this date, and the date established above, p. 26, for the Chronicler's work are approximately correct, a better case can be made for the compiler of Esdras being the one who made the change. The editors of the RSV have no valid reason for following Esdras against both MT and LXX.

[2]J. Gray, Legacy[2], p. 207, lists instances of the presence of singers at Megiddo ca. 1350-1100 B.C., and in Byblos at the time of Wen-Amon. He also follows Albright, ARI, p. 127, in identifying the "sons of Mahol" (I Kings 4:31, MT 5:11) as "members of the orchestra guild." The Ugaritic šrm in the administrative texts are apparently a singer's guild. Albright, ARI, pp. 125-29 discusses these more fully. He maintains that there is clear evidence that "Hebrew Temple music as such was recognized in Israel as going back to early pre-Israelite sources," (p. 128). See p. 125ff for details and bibliography on what Albright calls "incontrovertible external evidence for the antiquity of the musical guilds" including the šarîm 'singers' who "formed a class of temple personnel at Ugarit cir. 1400 B.C." (p. 209, n. 93a). Albright, Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan, pp. 249-52, argues that even the names Ethan and Heman (I Chron. 2:6) are related to the Phoenician Tabion and the Ugaritic Attuyanu and Tabiyanu who appear as members of the guild of

families are specified and mention is made of harps, lyres, bronze cymbals, trumpets, and those who were to play them.[1] Most of those so designated are Gershonites, but as noted above, members of the group are also drawn from the Kohathites and the Merarites.[2] Harrison comments on the genealogical lists of the musicians, writing that "the Chronicler was drawing knowledgeably upon a well-attested tradition."[3] He notes that had the Chronicler been interested in fabricating such a history he would have supplied a complete list from Levi to 587 B.C. The list, as it stands, contains twenty-two generations from Levi to Heman, a contemporary of David, and only four from Heman to the fall of Jerusalem. Harrison concludes, "This state of affairs points to the authenticity of the earlier list and the fact that the Chronicler was entirely unwilling to fabricate material in order to cover that particular extent of time for which he had no detailed information."[4]

The role of the musicians was an extensive one.

---

singers and dancers associated with the ancient Phoenician cult.

[1]Ulrich S. Leupold, "Worship Music in Ancient Israel: Its Meaning and Purpose," Canadian Journal of Theology, XV (1969), 176-86 is a recent discussion of this topic.

[2]Slotki, Ezra, p. 121, notes that only the Asaphites seem to have continued in this office after the return.

[3]Harrison, Intro., p. 1167.

[4]Ibid., see above, pp. 46-53.

Although no details are given regarding their duties, I Chron. 9:33 indicates that they were on twenty-four hour call, and consequently free from other duties in the cult. The titles of several of the psalms suggest that certain tunes and instrumentation were to be used on specific occasions, and the comment in I Chron. 15:22 that Chenaniah should direct the music "for he understood it" bears out the view that complex musical forms and/or arrangements were part of the cultic pattern.[1]

There is some dispute regarding the role of women in the musical service. Ezra 2:65 and Neh. 7:67 mention "male and female singers." Gray argues that these were "secular musicians" rather than temple singers, on the basis of the general principle that "from the later period--from the Exile onwards, and indeed from an even earlier period we may with confidence assert that women were not admitted to the priestly office or to Levitical service."[2] Eichrodt, on the other hand, uses these two references along with Exod. 38:8 and I Sam. 2:22 to say, "Women, however, still had their place in worship at the sanctuary and as singers even in the Judaic period."[3] Again, the inclusion of this difficult

---

[1]See e.g. the superscriptions to Psalms 4, 5, 6-9, 12, 22, 45, 46, 54-62, 67, 69, 75-77, 80-81, 84, 88.

[2]G. B. Gray, Sacrifice, pp. 185-93, especially p. 191.

[3]Eichrodt, Theology, I, p. 131, n. 3. He makes reference to M. Löhr, Die Stellung des Weibes zu Jahwereligion und Kult (1908), pp. 49ff. See also the article by Leupold

expression in the text is more easily explicable on the premise that the Chronicler was carefully recording his sources. Such an "invention" on his part would be totally out of place in the post-exilic period when the exclusion of women from the cultic activity developed.

(b) Gatekeepers. A similar guild is the group identified as the gatekeepers הַשֹּׁעֲרִים, "porters" (Ugaritic *tgrm*).[1] I Chron. 9 identifies them as Korahites; in chapter 26, some of the sons of Merari are also included; and in chapter 15 the Gershonites also function as porters of the ark.[2] The gatekeepers, then, seem to be drawn from all three branches of the Levitical family[3] and appear to have been organized into groups who functioned on a rotating basis (I Chron. 9:25). As with the singers, there is evidence of a leader or leaders of the gatekeepers who coordinated the functions, Phinehas, son of Eliazar, being the traditional head of the group (I Chron. 9:20). Apparently the normal order was that the headship passed from father to first-born

---

in Can. J. of Theol. (1969), pp. 176-86.

[1] J. Gray, Legacy[2], p. 215.

[2] See above, pp. 146-47.

[3] It could be argued that the passages in Ezra 2:42; 7:24; 10:24; and Neh. 10:28; 11:19 indicate that the gatekeepers did not have Levitical status. However, these texts may simply assume the singers and the gatekeepers to be included as sub-divisions of the Levites as they are elsewhere. If this is so, a more serious difficulty is whether or not the נתינים are also "Levites." See below, pp. 158-59.

son, although there is at least one instance in which this was not the case. I Chron. 26:10 notes that Shimmi the son of Hosah, although not the firstborn, was "made chief" by his father.[1]

One widely practiced ancient cultic ritual concerns the use of some sort of sacred ark or chest that was a kind of traveling shrine.[2] Among the pre-Islamic Arabs, tent-shrines containing the tribal idols were made of red leather and of a size suitable for carrying on the back of a camel. Sacrifices to the resident deity were often brought to it, and oracular decisions sought there. The shrine was also used as a talisman in battle, often accompanied by the sheikh's daughter or another young woman to encourage the fighting spirit of the army. While these shrines were in the camp, they were cared for by a special group of women.

There is an obvious parallel here to the Israelite Ark of the Covenant and the tabernacle, the tabernacle functioning as the shrine and the Ark as the "deity." While the evidence for these Arabic and Syrian shrines postdates even

---

[1]At Nuzi it was possible to demote the firstborn and give pride of place to a younger son. See C. J. Mullo-Weir, "Nuzi," in Thomas, Archeology and Old Testament Study, pp. 73-86.

[2]Frank Moore Cross, Jr., "The Priestly Tabernacle," The Biblical Archaeologist, X (1947), 45-68, reprinted in G. Ernest Wright and David Noel Freedman (eds.), The Biblical Archaeologist Reader (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1961), 201-28. Page references are to the reprint. Cross, p. 217, identifies these shrines by the words ʿutfah, mahmal, or qubbah. De Vaux, Ancient Israel, p. 296, calls them ʿutfa, merkab, or abu-Dhur.

the latest possible date for the Chronicler, Cross is undoubtedly right when he says, "We must suppose that the portable red leather tent was one of the oldest motifs in Semitic religion."[1]

While there is evidently some relationship among these institutions, there are two clear differences which need to be considered: these Arabic qubbahs were cared for by women and carried on camels. The role of women in the Israelite cult was apparently minimal, possibly in part a reaction against the Canaanite fertility cults which posed such a threat to Israel. That the male Levites should be given the duty of "ministering" in the tabernacle and temple is in harmony with the whole male-oriented cult and priesthood of Israel.[2]

With the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem there was no further need of these porters to be concerned with the

---

[1]Cross, "Tabernacle," p. 219. See also de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 295-97, and Julian Morgenstern, "The Ark, the Ephod and the Tent of Meeting," Hebrew Union College Annual, XVII (1943), 153-264; XVIII (1944), 1-52. Morgenstern's article contains an extensive treatment of both ancient and modern parallels to these Hebrew cultic institutions, and a bibliography to his other writings on the topics.

[2]Although Exod. 38:8 refers to "the ministering women who ministered at the door of the ten of meeting" this seems to be an exception. This is an intriguing passage, but more than a little obscure. If the statement that the bronze laver--or even its base--was made from the mirrors of these ministering women is to be taken at anywhere near face value, there were either a large number of these women or else they were extremely beauty conscious. That laver took a lot of bronze!

safe transportation of the paraphanalia of the tabernacle, so their attention turned more particularly to the care of the cult area (see I Chron. 23:26).[1] For the Chronicler, the shift was the only logical one. The new responsibilities of the new situation should fall to the appropriate branch of the hereditary Levites.

(c) Temple Servants. The third major classification under the guilds is that of the temple servants נְתִינִים (Ugaritic ytnm).[2] There is no clear indication in the Chronicler that these were in fact "Levites."[3] While they appear frequently in association with the singers and the gatekeepers (e.g., Ezra 7:7; 8:20), there is no identification of them as descendants of Levi. Rather there is the unanimous

---

[1]The fact that the tabernacle and its equipment was carried by men rather than on camel back is in keeping with the Israelite designation of the camel as an unclean animal (Lev. 11:4). Apart from the patriarchal stories in Genesis (and Job), the camel never plays an important role among the Israelites. It is always a foreign animal, associated with the non-Jew. I Chron. 12:40 has the camel being used to transport food for Israel, but it is significant that in chapter 13 the Ark is conveyed on an ox-drawn cart. Even the oare of the royal camels of David are given into the hands of an alien, Obil the Ishmaelite.

[2]J. Gray, Legacy[2], p. 215 refers to Gordon UH, p. 301 where 50 families and six individuals are listed as ytnm "temple servitors."

[3]The "sons of the servants of Solomon" בְּנֵי עַבְדֵי שְׁלֹמֹה (Ezra 2:55-57; Neh. 7:57-59; 11:3) are never identified as Levites although they appear in context with the נְתִינִים. They are frequently considered to be "king's slaves" on the basis of I Kings 9:15-28. However, Levine, JBL (1962), 209-10 argues cogently for identifying them as Solomon's "royal officers," i.e., "members of a guild of royal merchants."

evidence that they were appointed during the Davidic period (Ezra 8:20). Rabbinic tradition, on the basis of Josh. 9:3, identified them as Gibeonites[1] but no biblical source makes this identification. The group of נְתִינִים identified as "sons of Keros" (Ezra 2:44; Neh. 7:47f), were apparently functionaries, or at least known, at sixth century Arad, for a Stratum IV ostraca names them there.

Some Levites are identified as נְתִינִים in Num. 3:9; 8:16, 19, but most scholars consider them as a different group from the Chronicler's נְתִינִים.[2] The broad general meaning of "those given to serve in the sanctuary" is established as early as the Ugaritic cult.[3]

The most that can be safely claimed of this group is that for the Chronicler, there was a guild of temple servants appointed by David, who were in association with the other two guilds of cultic officials, but who are never explicitly identified as Levites.

---

[1]Slotki, Ezra, p. 121. The rabbinic source is given as Yebamoth 79a.

[2]See Levine, JBL (1963), pp. 207-12, and E. A. Speiser, Israel Exploration Journal, XIII (1963), 70ff for two recent discussions of these groups. Pfeiffer, Introduction, pp. 798-99, and Cody, pp. 167-69 also discuss these in some detail.

[3]See Gordon, Ugaritic Handbook, text 301, and William Foxwell Albright, "Old Testament and Canaanite Language and Literature," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, VII (1945), pp. 5-31.

2. The Origins of the Priesthood

The final section of this chapter focuses on an examination of the Chronicler's treatment of the origin of the Israelite priesthood. He has made several direct statements on this topic, and a large number of passing references in larger contexts. For the most part he does not set out to marshall detailed arguments, but appears to work on the assumption that the whole tradition is common knowledge to his readers.

i. Mosaic

Underlying the role which the Chronicler assigns to the priesthood is the basic assumption that the origin and formal organization of the Israelite priesthood goes back to the wilderness wanderings and Moses. The Chronicler refers thirty times to Moses, most frequently in conjunction with the "book of the Law" or with specific cultic orientation. Moses, of course, is not himself the father of the priesthood; that position belongs to his brother Aaron. Eichrodt remarks that it is impossible to categorize Moses in the usual ways. "He is neither a king nor a commander of an army, nor a tribal chieftain, nor a priest nor an inspired seer or medicine man. To some extent he belongs to all those categories; but none of them adequately explain his position."[1]

---

[1]Eichrodt, Theology, I, 289.

Rather he is the one who is the organizer, the one who shapes the structure of the priesthood.

According to I Chron. 23:13-14, it was Aaron who was "set apart to consecrate the most holy things, that he and his sons forever should burn incense before the Lord and minister to him and pronounce blessings in his name forever." This passage, and I Chron. 24:19, have been appealed to as evidence that Moses did not really share in this ministry, but that he was only included by way of contrast. However, the Deuteronomic tradition preserved in Exod. 28, and the P tradition of Leviticus, both of which attribute the details of the establishment of the cult, the ritual, and the orders of the priesthood to Moses, are generally supported by the Chronicler.[1]

Seven passages are important here. I Chron. 6:49 (MT 6:34), II Chron. 30:16 and 35:4-6 make specific reference to ritual sacrifice and to the mechanics of making atonement according to the directions God had given through Moses. In the matter of the organization of the priestly orders there is the simple statement (I Chron. 15:13-15, II Chron. 23:18; Ezra 6:18) that the divisions of the priests and the courses of the Levites are based on what is known to be written in the book of Moses. No detail is spelled out in these passages as to how this is to be done. The

---

[1]On this tradition, see above, pp. 108-09.

assumption of the Chronicler seems to be that it does not need explaining, it is common knowledge. Such simplistic presentation is incredible if there is no long-established tradition which is widely known among the constituency.[1]

ii. Davidic

While the Chronicler affirms an underlying Mosaic origin for the priesthood, he is not content to rest it on that single basis. As indicated above[2] his overriding concern is the theological one of illustrating the historical unity of Israel's two covenants--the Mosaic and the Davidic. To this end he devotes a considerable amount of space to the role of David in the organization and support of the cultic officials. Von Rad's states that the Chronicler "starts with David [and that] . . . without David there would not even be the Levitical officers in which the writer has so great an interest."[3] This is somewhat overstated, perhaps, but it does underscore the high regard in which the

---

[1]There is no legitimate reason for questioning the widespread knowledge of such a tradition. John Gray, Legacy[2], p. 216, cites a Ugaritic text (UH 62) concerning the high priest Atnprln and the Baal-myth as "valuable evidence of the manner of the transmission of tradition. It is said that Atnprln 'taught' (hmd) the particular version of the myth which was inscribed by El mlk." This is a clear indication of the existence of written and oral traditions side by side in the same culture. The knowledge of the precise details of the tradition may be rather sketchy with much of the population, but certainly the main lines of the argument would be common knowledge to a people as cult-oriented as Israel.

[2]Above, pp. 32-38. [3]Von Rad, Theology, I, 350.

Chronicler held the Davidic role. Solomon's prayer in II Chron. 6:42, "O Lord God, do not turn away the face of thy anointed one! Remember thy steadfast love for David thy servant," is in the Deuteronomic tradition, but serves to point up the attitude of the Chronicler toward David. By divine election and the choice of the people he was to be king and the founder of a dynasty of kings over a united Israel.[1]

His relationship with Samuel, the last in the line of charismatic judges,[2] paved the way for his unique achievement, the uniting of "the very diverse religious forces to be found in Israel under the leadership of the monarchy and at the same time to secure the indispensable constitutional basis which would ensure the effectiveness of the kingly office."[3] Von Rad's identification of David as a "second Moses"[4] is well chosen. David was extremely influential in his dealings with the priesthood, yet continued to recognize the diverse functions of priest and political leaders.[5] He prepared the way for the coming temple, even to the

---

[1]See Welch, Post-exilic Judaism, p. 196.

[2]I Chron. 9:22, "David and Samuel the seer established them (the gatekeepers) in their office of trust."

[3]Eichrodt, Theology, I, 447.

[4]Von Rad, Theology, I, 351.

[5]I Chron. 18:9-11, the account of David dedicating booty and tribute to Yahweh illustrates the close link between the royal house and the cult.

extent of receiving "by divine inspiration the pattern of the future temple, the center of worship for all Israel, and under the same guidance he laid down regulations for worship there."[1] All of this reinforces the Chronicler's perspective on the role of David in the shaping of the cult in the early years of the monarchy.[2]

David's excellent relationship with the priests at Nob marks him as a man who was widely trusted, and who was able to win the allegiance of diverse groups. From the beginning he "saw clearly that the priesthood was sociologically related to the monarchy, and consequently indispensable to it, and he therefore decisively associated it with his religious program . . . [to create] . . . a close association between the royal and religious functions."[3] Welch describes David's "two great gifts" to Israel as the kingdom and the temple. The kingdom was lost through disobedience and ignoring the prophetic messengers, "but David's other gift remained, and in it and its worship was the hope for

---

[1]Welch, PEJ, p. 196, cf. von Rad, Theology, I, 351.

[2]See Liver, "Korah," p. 216, and Welch, Work, p. 25.

[3]Eichrodt, Theology, I, 446. Gray, Legacy[2], pp. 209-17 comments extensively on the relationship between the king and the cult personnel at Ugarit. In the Krt and Aqht texts, which apparently describe the heroic age of the Ugarit settlement, the king himself serves as priest. By the time of the Late Bronze Age texts there is a division of labor with "no less than twelve different families of priests" (p. 215, Gordon UH 400, VI, 21f) and a named high priest (p. 216, Gordon UH 62, 11. 54-56).

the future of Israel."[1]

According to I Chron. 28:19, the temple plans were given to David by Yahweh.[2] He in turn was to transmit them to Solomon (I Chron. 28:11-19), and Solomon was bound to carry them out exactly (II Chron. 8:14-15). It is in this context that David's careful organization of the clergy must be considered. The divisions and assignment of duties to both priests and Levites is, for the Chronicler, the work of David, and the execution of those plans is committed to Solomon.[3]

I Chron. 22-26 gives the details of the organization of the priests, the Levites, and the guilds, expanding on the briefer passages in chapters six and fifteen. Much of this was original with David. Eissfeldt comments specifically that Chronicles has material on the role of the singers that cannot be traced any earlier than David.[4] Myers' comment is also well taken, that the idea that David was the organizer of the cult guilds in Israel is a tradition that "must not be cast aside lightly."[5] The Chronicler obviously intended to attribute the formal structure of the cult and the assignment of responsibilities to David.

---

[1]Welch, Work, p. 29. [2]See above, pp. 85-88.

[3]See ibid., p. 7.

[4]Eissfeldt, Introduction, p. 539.

[5]Myers, I Chron., p. 47.

However, he does not stop with David himself. All the way through the period of the divided kingdom the role of David in the establishment of the priesthood was prominent. Josiah (II Chron. 35:2-5), Hezekiah (II Chron. 31:2), Joash, and the high priest Johoida who ruled during Joash's minority (II Chron. 23:18-19), Jehoshaphat (II Chron. 19: 8-10), and Rehoboam (II Chron. 11:13-17; 13:9-10), had all been involved with reorganizing (or re-establishing) the priesthood after a period of spiritual decline in the southern kingdom. In every case they are portrayed as restoring, not inventing, already established practices.

Nehemiah, acting as the formally appointed governor, and fulfilling his responsibilities as royal representative, claims to have cleansed the priesthood from foreign elements and to have "established the duties of the priests and Levites, each in his work" (Neh. 13:30). Myers translates this, "set up orders of service for the priests and Levites so that each knew his work,"[1] and comments that "the renewal does not appear to have been a new arrangement; it was rather a reorganization of the temple services said by the Chronicler to have been instituted by David."[2] Nehemiah, then, appears to have been simply carrying out an ancient tradition.

---

[1]Myers, Ezra-Neh., p. 211.

[2]Ibid., p. 219.

In summary, the Chronicler credits David with organizing the cultic functionaries, drawing upon the established "Law of Moses" for his basic material, but enlarging the scope of the duties and responsibilities of the various groups to meet the new problems and opportunities of the cult as it moved from tabernacle to Temple. This is a shift from the perspective of the rest of the Hebrew canon which understands the Israelite priesthood to have taken its formal shape under Moses and Aaron during the wilderness experience.

CHAPTER V

THE CHRONICLER'S ROLE IN INTERPRETING THE ORIGIN OF THE PRIESTHOOD

The shattering blows of 587 B.C. effectively destroyed not only the walls of the city and the temple, but also the structure of the cult itself. Among the serious problems faced by the returning exiles were those of the restoration and reorganization of the cultic practices. Since the return, the cult had been restored, and the priesthood, filling the vacuum left by the defunct monarchy and the prophetic order, had become the shaper of the national life. It was into this situation that the Chronicler came.

Writing in the shadow of the growing influence of the priesthood during the last decades of the fifth century B.C., the Chronicler was faced with two interrelated problems: the fact that the Davidic monarchy was no more and the fact of the new political and cultural role of the priesthood. To this end, the Chronicler sought to draw together the traditions of the monarchy and of the priesthood. In this effort he made certain claims about the origin of the Israelite priesthood that reflect both similarities with and differences from the other sources. He is primarily a liturgical traditionalist, yet he is also a keen

synthesizer.[1]

1. The Chronicler as Repeater of the Traditions

There are a number of elements in the Chronicler's treatment of the priesthood that are in accord with the claims of the rest of the Old Testament for the origin of the priesthood.

(a) The priesthood was an ancient institution in Israel, traced back to the earliest days of the national history in the experiences of the wilderness wanderings.[2]

(b) The original structuring of the priesthood and its orders and duties was attributed to Moses, but with full awareness that there were others involved very early in the process.[3]

(c) This original shaping of the priesthood included the appointment of Aaron and his sons as the hereditary high priests. The close ties between Aaron and Moses were considered to be based on a blood relationship.[4]

---

[1]North, JBL (1963), p. 369, lists four themes which he considers central to the theology of the Chronicler. Two of these bear on the topic under discussion here--the cult. I.e., (1) "a revalorization of the usage regarded as Mosaic . . . a synthesis of Mosaic vs. Deuteronomistic tensions of the priesthood versus the Levites and the prophetic movement," and (2) "the vehicle of the theocratic messianism is not Moses on Sinai, but David in Zion." See below, pp. 190-91.

[2]See above, pp. 97-98, 106-7, 160-62.

[3]See above, pp. 108-9, 133-34.

[4]See above, pp. 108-9, 160-62.

(d) The placing of the cultic responsibilities for the nation upon the clan of Levi is also a common point of contact, although as has already been noted, the Chronicler expands considerably on the detailed functions of the Levites.[1]

(e) The traditional three-fold family division of the Levite clan is also retained by the Chronicler. He includes the definition of the roles each branch of the family played in the old tabernacle ritual.[2]

(f) Within this three-fold family division, the Chronicler retains the familiar distinction between "priests" and "Levites."[3] Most of the time he is careful to

---

[1]See above, pp. 109, 118-21, 143-44, 149-59.

[2]See above, pp. 115, 146-49.

[3]Liver, "Korah," Scr. Hier. (1961), p. 198, states, "The theory that the distinction between Priest and Levite was a late development is in itself unfounded. . . . The historical and social background of the story of the struggle of Korah the Levite against the privileges of the priesthood is to be sought in the relatively early period in the history of Israel." See also Kaufmann, Religion, pp. 193-200. R. Abba, "Priests and Levites," IDB, III:887 points out that this distinction between priests and Levites is really intrinsic to Deuteronomy. He notes that the term "the Levitical priests" occurs in Deut. 17:9, 18; 18:1; 24:8; 27:9; the expression "the priests, the sons of Levi" is found in Deut. 21:5; 31:9; the simple expression "the priests" is in Deut. 17:12; 18:3 (twice); 19:17; 20:2; 26:3-4. Philip C. Johnson, "Critical Problems in Deuteronomy" (Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, 1948), pp. 120-121, treats the passages in Deut. where "the Levites" alone are mentioned. In 10:8-9 and 33:8, the tribal use of the word is clearly evident. In Deut. 12:12, 18, 19; 14:27, 29; 16:11, 14; and 26:11-13, the people are exhorted to be faithful in their support of the Levites. Specifically, in 18:6-7, the Levite who comes "from

distinguish these two categories, giving to the priests the primary cultic responsibilities and relegating the Levites to lesser roles. But at least once the Chronicler uses the familiar Deuteronomic title "the Levitical priests" for the chief cult officers.[1]

(g) The Chronicler preserves the tradition that David had a major role to play in the preservation of the cult symbol, the ark of the covenant. The privilege of bringing the ark to Jerusalem and the projection of plans for a permanent house for the ark are assigned to David by both the Chronicler and the Deuteronomic historians.[2]

---

any of your towns out of all Israel where he live--and he may come when he desires--to the place which the Lord will choose, that he may minister שרת in the name of the Lord his God like all his fellow-Levites who stand to minister עמד there before the Lord." Only in Deut. 31:25-26 is there some difficulty. There the "Levites" are commanded to put the law book "by the side of the ark of the covenant." Apparently, these are the same group as the "priests, the sons of Levi" mentioned in verse nine. Johnson, p. 119, draws attention to the work of H. Pope, The Date of the Composition of Deuteronomy on the use of the words for the services of the priest and Levite in the Pentateuch. Except for Num. 18:7, "the service of the priest is always cahan. . . . The service of the Levites is always abad. When the whole tribe, that is both priests and Levites is meant, and the general priestly service of the whole is indicated, the term sharath is used. This distinction in terms is observed only in the Pentateuch. . . ." See also, Wright, VT, IV (1954), 325-330 and Emerton, VT, XII (1962), 129-138.

[1]See above, pp. 141-42.

[2]II Sam. 6-7; I Chron. 6:31 (MT 6:16); 13-17; 22:19; 28:2, 18; II Chron. 1:4; 5:2; 6:11-41; 8:11; 35:3. Von Rad, Theology, I:351, n. 10, comments that the extensive interest of the Chronicler in the history of the Ark at such a late date is remarkable.

(h) In ancient Near Eastern society, the priests are, for the most part, conservators of the liturgical tradition.[1] So it is in Israel. In addition to the specific item mentioned above on the origin and structure of the priesthood, there is a considerable body of material directly associated with the cult which illustrates the Chronicler's essential conservatism.

The Chronicler's use of the key covenant term משפט is one example.[2] A very common word in the prophetic and Deuteronomic writings, משפט appears twenty-eight times in the Chronicler. Five times it is used in a definite cultic situation related to covenant renewal (I Chron. 16:12, 14 at the time of David's bringing the ark to Jerusalem, II Chron. 6:35, 39 at Solomon's dedication of the temple, and Neh. 9:13 in Ezra's dedicatory prayer for the purification of the people). In these instances it is used in context with a large number of phrases and words which are clearly paralleled in other psalms and prayers.[3]

---

[1]E.g., at Ugarit (Gordon, UT, 62:53), and in Egypt following the short-lived Iknaton reform movement.

[2]Ahlstrom, p. 124, following Hammershaimb, suggests that משפט is a central theme in Canaanite religion and was adopted by Israel. If this is valid, the case for Israelite priestly traditionalism is strengthened considerably.

[3]Myers, I Chron., p. 121, and Ezra-Neh., pp. 167-169, lists the parallels and their sources in some detail. He also suggests a considerable number of verbal parallels in the Qumran literature.

Three times משפט is used to describe the work of the king or his appointed judges (I Chron. 18:14; II Chron. 9:8; 19:5-7), and in this last context (II Chron. 19:8) certain "Levites and priests and heads of families of Israel" are appointed as an appeal court to hear and decide disputed cases from the outlying districts. And several times individuals come under either curses or blessings according to their practice of משפט.[1]

In addition to these uses, there are two others which bear directly on the topic under discussion. As already noted, much of the work of the Chronicler is taken up with the description of the detailed organization of the temple personnel and of the responsibilities of the various groups. Here, משפט is used as a pattern of service. In I Chron. 6:32 (MT 6:17) and 24:19, משפט is used of the rules established by God and transmitted through Aaron or David to describe the assignments in the temple. The guilds of singers and temple servants are to perform specific duties in accordance with a specific pattern (I Chron. 6:32). So too are the various groups of the priests to carry out their duties at the appropriate time in accordance with "the procedure established for them . . ." (24:19).

---

[1]E.g., I Chron. 15:13, Uzzah's death; 22:13; 28:7, II Chron. 7:17, Solomon's blessings; II Chron. 33:7-8, Manasseh's idolatry; Ezra 7:10; Neh. 1:7; 9:29; 10:30, in the situation Ezra identifies as being caused by neglect of the ordinances.

In II Chron. 8:14, the final step in fulfilling the divine pattern in the construction of the temple is the appointment by Solomon, "according to the ordinance," of the orders of the priesthood and servants.[1] The ritual of sacrifice and the part each group played in it was already established. It now had merely to be transferred from tabernacle to temple.

This tradition survived the Solomonic age. When Hezekiah revived the Passover celebration, the priests "took their accustomed posts [כְּמִשְׁפָּטָם] (II Chron. 30:16) according to the law of Moses. The duty was specified, given by revelation from a man of God, and followed carefully. Yet, as Myers points out, this was not a slavish adherence to a ritual order. The observation of the public ceremony in the second month rather than the first, and the fact that many of the people had not undergone ritual purification, did not destroy the efficacy of the prayer of contrition.[2] Nevertheless, assignments had been made according to prior revelation and a pattern of specific duties set. These were the "customs" of service.

Closely linked with the idea of משפט as a pattern of personal service is the concept of משפט as a ritual pattern

---

[1]Myers, I Chron., p. 50.

[2]Ibid. Note here that the Chronicler makes no attempt to "correct" the details of the story to fit the requirements of the law. This is further evidence that the Chronicler is careful in his use of his sources.

of access to God. In I Chron. 23, the numbering of the Levites according to families has a definite practical reason. Duties are assigned to them to replace the now unnecessary arrangements for transporting the tabernacle. But the change of duty does not alter the pattern of ritual service. The types of offerings, the times of the daily service, the number and times of the other offerings are to be carried out "according to the number required of them" (v. 31). These legal requirements are the responsibility of the appointed servants.

Twice in II Chron. 4 the sanctuary candlesticks are described as having been made "as prescribed" (vv. 7, 20), and set in the sanctuary. There is no indication in the account as to the origin of the pattern, but in keeping with the usual understanding that any משפט had its origin with God, presumably the temple pattern was regarded as having divine origin (I Chron. 28:11-19), just as the account in Exodus presents the blueprint of the tabernacle as being from God.

Once in Ezra 3:4 and again in Neh. 8:18, the post-exilic community re-institutes a feast "according to the ordinance" of the written Torah. In this way, the re rned community preserved the former ceremonies, just as Josiah did when he restored the Passover ceremony (II Chron. 35:13). The method of preparing the Passover, the number and times of the offerings, and the order of events in the feast days

are all משפטים, given patterns to be followed.

It is evident that the Chronicler drew heavily on traditional religious ideas and terminology in his work. The preservation of the concepts of rule and discrimination or judgment in the Davidic as well as the post-exilic sections is even more impressive in light of the tendency to understand משפט as "custom" or "pattern" in the description of the Levitical and priestly offices which are described in such detail.

It was through the Levites that much of this tradition was preserved.[1] They were the links with the Mosaic ritual and had been able to adapt to the new situation. Their favor with the royal house of David and their involvement with the Jerusalem sanctuary guaranteed their prominence in the Chronicler for whom "the person and dynasty forms the heartbeat" of theology.[2]

---

[1]See Eichrodt, Theology, I:398.

[2]North, JBL (1963), 375. Eichrodt, Theology, I:64-65, argues that the Davidic covenant "in Chronicles forms the basic element of the writer's theological outline of history: however it also plays such a prominent part in the passages of a liturgical prophetic character from the post-exilic period, that it must patently have been dear to the faith long before the Chronicler. . . . On the basis of certain reliable pieces of evidence from the monarchial period such as II Sam. 23:5 and Psalm 132, . . . the Davidic dynasty very early based its claims to suzerainty on a special covenant with Yahweh." If, as some argue, Psalm 78 is also pre-exilic, the use of בחר in v. 70 tends to support Eichrodt's position. But see below, pp. 185-86.

2. The Chronicler as Innovator

As indicated above, the Chronicler has his basic structure of the priesthood in common with the rest of the Old Testament. But the crux of the Chronicler's claims regarding the origins of the priesthood comes in those areas where his account and the rest of the Old Testament differ. There are key areas where he has significant omissions and others where he has synthesized varying traditions so as to arrive at some innovative interpretations. The differences reflected in the synoptic tradition have been discussed above,[1] so that in the context of this chapter it is essential to consider those areas where there is significant development beyond the rest of the Old Testament.

(a) The Chronicler is very careful to reserve the term כהן for members of the Levites who serve at the altar as priests. The clearest example of this restricted definition is found in I Chron. 18:17. In that passage, David's sons are identified only as הָרִאשֹׁנִים לְיַד הַמֶּלֶךְ, while II Sam. 8:18 calls them כֹּהֲנִים.[2] Much as the Chronicler stresses the

---

[1]Above, pp. 40-46.

[2]The point at issue here is not the historical accuracy of the role of David's sons, but rather the Chronicler's use of כהן. There is no indication elsewhere that David's sons did actually serve in the priestly capacity. This, supported by the LXX reading αυλαρχαι "chief of the court" rather than ιερεις may suggest that they had authority within the temple precincts without actually performing as priests. Their presence there, along with their obvious

contribution of David to the cult, he appears unwilling to grant David's sons status as either "Levites" or כהנים.

(b) Where the older traditions reflect the fulfillment of priestly duties by the heads of families, the Chronicler ignores this area completely. No example of the role of family priests is preserved in his work. All priestly duties are reserved for the specially elected priestly family, the sons of Levi.

(c) While the Deuteronomic history begins the story of the kingdom with the gradual unification of the nation under the charismatic leaders, the judges, and Saul, the Chronicler begins his narrative with the death of Saul and the accession of David. Aside from the fact that the Chronicler is primarily concerned with the Davidic dynasty, the choice of that starting point allows the Chronicler to sidestep the earlier history and the problems that raises with elements such as the introduction of family priests and the Danite priesthood.

(d) The Deuteronomic history does not seem overly

---

leadership, may be the explanation for the MT using כהן in the sense of one who works in the temple. The Chronicler, on the other hand, uses כהן and "Levite" in the narrower sense, and since David's sons did not meet these criteria, they are identified differently by the Chronicler. One other alternative is the possibility that the Chronicler used a textual recension similar to the one underlying the LXX here, as he apparently did elsewhere. (See Chapter II on this.)

concerned with the relationship of the king to the priesthood. True, Saul was condemned for taking the right to sacrifice into his own hands (I Sam. 13:8-15), but the context of that passage suggests that the reason for the condemnation was not so much the act of sacrificing, but the attitude of disobedience.[1] The Chronicler, on the other hand, is adamant in his refusal to let a king, even David, take active part in cultic sacrifice. The episode of Uzziah's leprosy, passed over lightly in II Kings 15:5, was regarded by the Chronicler (II Chron. 26:16-20) as the direct result of his presumptuousness in usurping the priestly right to offer incense on the altar. The Chronicler rigorously maintained the distinctive areas of service for royalty and priesthood.

(e) In all of the Old Testament there is considerable interest in genealogical lists. The Chronicler followed an already established pattern in using them in his work. However, his main interest was in the genealogies of the priests and Levites.[2] He drew extensively on earlier canonical lists, but apparently had access to others besides. The two major differences in the Chronicler are the specific emphases on the Levitic ancestry of Elkanah,[3] and the

---

[1]Cf. I Sam. 15:22-23; 28:15-19.

[2]See above, pp. 50-52, 133-41.

[3]See above, pp. 50-51.

Aaronide line of Zadok.[1] These are both new here, but as indicated above, a case can be made for the validity of these claims.

(f) The limiting of the highest order of cult service to the priests, and relegating the Levites to a somewhat secondary role is clearer in the Chronicler than elsewhere,[2] but Welch argues that "no other document except the pact and work of the Chronicler set Levite and priest on an equal footing as servants of the cult."[3]

The Chronicler, however, was not willing to give the Zadokites, in spite of their close links with David, the exclusive right to the priesthood as Ezekiel was prepared to do. According to Neh. 10, the priesthood is for all the Aaronites. The Chronicler's innovative tendencies apparently are kept under control by the nature of the sources he draws on for his material.

(g) Another area where the Chronicler moves beyond the rest of the Old Testament is in the highly developed categorization of tasks for the various branches of the Levites. The Chronicler's role here is not one of originating the concept of clearly defined responsibilities and areas

---

[1] See above, pp. 135-41. [2] See above, pp. 143-44.

[3] Welch, Work, p. 159, commenting on the role of the Levites in Ezekiel. They are reduced to the status of menials because of their role in the northern apostasy.

of service for branches of the cultic personnel. As noted above,[1] the guild system in the ancient Near East is known from at least the middle of the second millennium B.C. The assignment of members of the cultic personnel (the qdšm) to particular duties was practised by the Ugaritic priesthood at least 300 years before David. Associated with this is the ancient institution of the sacred tent-shrine and its cult objects.[2] Both of these items, so prominent in the Chronicler, are seen to have roots in the common cultic practices of the ancient Near East.

Nor should it be thought strange that the Chronicler assigns the responsibility for these areas to various groups of "Levites"[3] for these Levites were the traditionally established cult functionaries. He simply carries it further than his predecessors. Specifically, the idea that Levites, rather than just "priests," should carry the ark is at least as old as the Deuteronomistic history. The first reference to the assignment of Levites to carry the ark is in Deut. 10:8. Similarly, in Josh. 3:3; 8:33, the "Levitical priests" are the ones delegated to carry it. These passages are

---

[1] Above, pp. 124, n. 2, 149-59.

[2] Often this took the form of an image or object that served as a throne or footstool for the deity. Cf. de Vaux, Ancient Israel, pp. 297-302, Cross, "Tabernacle," pp. 206-23, and above, pp. 156-57.

[3] The occasional references to Korah and Asaph in the Psalm titles suggest this. See above, pp. 121-22.

generally considered to be from the hand of the Deuteronomist, and therefore antedate the Chronicler by at least 250 years. The idea that priests should carry the ark is of course much older than the Deuteronomist. The Chronicler indicates that these duties were assigned to the Levites during the early years of the monarchy.

The obvious difference of emphasis in the Chronicler on the role of the Levites has often been appealed to as evidence that the Levites did not, in fact, play an important role in the pre-exilic cult, but were, at best, relegated to the role of menial servants to the priests. The Chronicler's interest in the Levites is seen as theologically motivated so that he could justify their role in the later cult. In this light, Lemke's observation is important.[1] He notes that in only thirty-eight out of 127 cases where the Chronicler deviates from the parallels in the earlier history can there be found any theological motive for the change. Lemke argues that the synoptic passages do not sustain the point of view of deliberate change by the Chronicler on theological grounds.

Several factors may have influenced this division of labor. These are more applicable to the earlier period than to the post-exilic time. The growing population called for a larger priesthood if the cult was to be carried out

---

[1]Lemke, "Studies," pp. 239-40.

efficiently. The concentration of worship at Jerusalem and the subsequent lessening of the importance of local shrines also demanded a better organization of the cult personnel. And thirdly, the shift from a tabernacle-oriented to a temple-oriented cultus demanded new roles for the officials to whom was delegated the responsibility for transporting and caring for the tabernacle. In this context an expanded role for musicians and singers is spelled out. Hence the Chronicler deals at considerable length with the new duties assigned to the various groups. His position is that all of these changes were the work of David, based on the prior tradition of the Mosaic origin of the priesthood.

(h) The Chronicler's most far-reaching innovation was the linking of the Davidic and Mosaic covenants that resulted from his development of the role of David in reorganizing the cultus.[1] Much of the material which deals with this development is not recorded elsewhere in the biblical

---

[1]Von Rad seems to have a valid suggestion when he states that "this confluence of the pictures of Moses and David at so late a time is interesting, but the differences in the new formulation of the tradition are unmistakable" (Theology, I:351). However, perhaps he overstates his case when he argues that P deals with the erection of the tabernacle and the Aaronide line, while the Chronicler neglects these to stress the place of the ark and the setting up of the new officers, the Levites, from among those whose primse responsibility had been that ark. If, in fact, P antedates the prophetic movement (see Kaufmann, Religion, pp. 193-200), this is precisely the stress that would be expected in P, while Chronicles, drawing heavily on kingdom sources, would move in the direction of modifying the earlier tabernacle cult in favor of the new situation.

tradition, so it is natural to raise the question as to the historical accuracy of these details. In an examination of the question several factors are important.

The role of the king in the cultic practices of the ancient Near East societies is well established, so that the precedent for the Chronicler's attributing such a role to David is set. It has been shown above[1] that the type of cultic organization which the Chronicler describes has its roots in the guilds known from the pre-Israelitic culture of Canaan. According to the Chronicler, it was David who introduced that guild structure via the Levites into the temple service.[2]

The Chronicler's genealogies give evidence of having been derived from carefully preserved source documents, and reasonable explanations can be offered for those particularly difficult sections.[3] There has been archeological verification not only for the design, but also for the method of construction of large temples similar to that described by the Chronicler and attributed to Solomon.[4] These data,

---

[1]Above, pp. 124-27, 149-59.

[2]Von Rad, Theology, I:352, lays heavy stress on the musician's guilds in Chron. He refers to Rudolf, Chronichbucher, pp. xvf., who argues that the extensive place given to the motifs of praise and joy requires that "we must not see in Chronicles in its present form simply the deposit of the theology of the post-exilic community as a whole, but only one of a particular trend, that of the Levitical temple singers."

[3]Above, pp. 46-53, 135-41. [4]Above, pp. 85-88.

alongside the general pattern demonstrated in Chapter II, that where the Chronicler can be checked by means of external data he is found to be a careful, dependable historian, make it feasible to suggest that unless there is some clear-cut impossibility in his arguments, the Chronicler may be given some benefit of the doubt in those areas where external control data are not available.

But this sort of argument does not explain why this material was never recorded before in the biblical accounts, nor does it establish its essential validity. Again the answer must be tentative and speculative, but three possible answers have been suggested. First, it is not beyond probability that there was a felt need in the community to record these traditions before they were forgotten entirely. The judgment of the exile and the dispersion were still fresh in the memories of the people and there was always the possibility of another disaster from which no memory of the past would be preserved.

On the other hand, Eichrodt suggests that the whole philosophical situation of the people had changed. Yahweh would not bring judgment again on Israel. "The Temple and its priesthood were signs of the covenant grace of God that would never cease, and in Law and cultus provided the means to the establishment of a righteous nation whose future was

guaranteed by the righteousness of God."[1] The apostasy of the nation had already been judged and the way back was known. Now, "if the law of Israel was still to go out from Jerusalem and to control the lives and guide the worship of every believing Jew, there must be a priestly college whose authority was recognized as final throughout the nation."[2] That college was the Levitical priesthood. For the Chronicler, the unification of the two covenants, the Mosaic and the Davidic, solves the problem neatly. While the remnants of the northern kingdom would tend to repudiate the Davidic claims to dynasty, apparently they were willing to accept the Mosaic/Levitical prerogatives.

Third, the Chronicler could simply have made up the new materials out of whole cloth. This is a rather widely held view. However, this bears directly on the role of the Chronicler as historian. Certainly he had a theological (cultic) purpose in his writing--that was precisely in the Hebrew tradition--but to say that does not say that he invented the accounts. The whole field of contemporary Old Testament theology has been influenced by the rediscovery of what might be called the credibility of the survival of liturgical/cultic tradition and practice in all of the ancient Near East.[3] A carefully informed theologian cannot

---

[1]Eichrodt, Theology, I:269. [2]Welch, P.E.J., p. 179.

[3]See, e.g., Cyrus Gordon, "Higher Criticism and the Forbidden Fruit," Christianity Today, IV (1959), 131-134;

invent antecedents for his presentation; they must have been already in existence, particularly in a society where such tradition played an important role. The appeal to משפט as a basic responsibility of a nation could not be based on a falsehood, no matter how piously expressed, else the whole structure would collapse.

The constant flux of new situations demanded an awareness of the past and the needs of the present, but as Gerhardsson notes in another context, "It is one thing to state that traditions have been marked by the milieu through which they passed; another to claim that they simply were created in this secondary milieu."[1] The function of the Chronicler as cultic historian is hedged by this tradition. Certainly he was an innovator, but "originality in history . . . does not consist merely in introducing something new; it combines elements which were already present into new forms having a wealth of meaning which would be quite impossible if an institution were entirely new, with no roots in

---

Gordon, Common Background, pp. 278-300; Harrison, Introduction, 78-82, 403-410, 495-541; Albright, CT, VIII (1962-63), 359-61.

[1]Birger Gerhardsson, Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964), p. 43. Gerhardsson is dealing specifically with the formcritical analysis of the N.T., but his criticism of that approach is based on pedagogic principles which have deep roots in the O.T. This pamphlet, and his longer book Memory and Manuscript, Acta Seminarii Neotestamentica Upsaliensis, XXII (trans. by Eric J. Sharpe, Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), especially pp. 56-66, 93-170, elucidates this methodology and its primary role in the ancient world.

the past."[1] This the Chronicler does. The role of the Davidic line and the activity of the priestly/levitic groups represent two covenantal strands that the Chronicler recognizes as part and parcel of the same basic covenant of Yahweh with Israel--two strands which are not mutually incompatible, but "two distinct elements in periodic tension."[2]

It becomes evident that the issue revolves not around the theological aims of the Chronicler as such, but rather around the extent to which his treatment of the Davidic/Mosaic priesthood in his history is historically accurate and how much he has idealized the facts to conform to his apologetic purpose. There can be no question that Israel understood herself as the recipient and guardian of strong historical, social, and cultic traditions. All the strands of the biblical record bear witness to this fact.[3]

---

[1]William Foxwell Albright, "New Testament Archeology," The Teacher's Yoke: Studies in Memory of Henry Trantham (ed. by E. Jerry Vardaman and James Leo Garrett, Jr.; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 1964), p. 40.

[2]William Foxwell Albright, "Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement," Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition, the Goldensen Lectures, 1955-1966 (Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1969), p. 167.

[3]See, e.g., Brevard S. Childs, Memory and Tradition in Israel, Studies in Biblical Theology, No. 37 (London: SCM Press, 1962), especially chapter IV, "Israel Remembers." On pp. 74-75 he summarizes. "Turning to the phrase 'Israel Remembers', our analysis revealed that the verb had no roots in one specific area of Israel's life, but arose out of the general sphere of human psychological behaviour. In this general sense it was employed widely throughout all phases of Israel's life. To remember was to call to mind a past event or situation, with the purpose of evoking some action.

What has been called the "incredible historical memory of Israel"[1] is evident in the whole development of Old Testament and early Judaism. Further, the link between the history and the cult is very close. Childs states, "Recent Old Testament scholarship has been almost unanimous in pointing out that the chief function of the cult was to actualize tradition. . . . Israel's tradition bears unmistakable signs of being transmitted in cultic form.[2]

For the Chronicler, careful historian that he is, the unity of the two covenants is an historical unity that can be traced accurately and logically back through David to Moses. He proposes to encourage the struggling nation to re-affirm its unity and its historically oriented mission to the world in devotion to Yahweh who not only had elected Israel, but had also revealed the institutions through which the nation was to be guided in its national and personal life.

The most significant result of our analysis was to discover that in certain instances the term lost its general psychological sense to take on a highly theological meaning. To remember was to actualize the past, to bridge the gap of time and to form a solidarity with the fathers. Israel's remembrance became a technical term to express the process by which later Israel made relevant the great redemptive acts which she recited in her tradition. The question of how to overcome the separation in time and space from the great events of the past became the paramount issue."

[1]William Foxwell Albright, "Toward a More Conservative View," Christianity Today, VII (1962-63), attributes this remark to Nelson Glueck.

[2]Childs, Memory and Tradition, p. 75.

It is in this light that North's statement that for the Chronicler, "the vehicle of the theocratic Messianism is not Moses on Sinai, but David in Zion,"[1] is of profound significance. The meaning and impact of the messianism of post-exilic Judaism and eventually of Christianity grew out of this linking of Davidic messianism and the established Temple cult. There are hints of it in the Psalms and the other pre-restoration literature, including the prophetic writings and the Deuteronomic history, but it is really the Chronicler who was the proponent of the point of view. Once he had stated it, it was seen to have been already implied in the earlier literature. The central expectation of both Christianity and Judaism, as well as of many of the sects of the intertestamental period, is that of the king/prophet/priest figure(s) who will restore the kingdom to the chosen people and bring in the Messianic age. The Chronicler built his theology, with its profound new perspective, not on manufactured evidence, but on a view of the priesthood and its relation with the monarchy which fits into known practice in the ancient Near East at least as early as the middle of the second millennium B.C., and which is in keeping with the tenacious liturgical tradition which permeates the whole of the Old Testament record.

---

[1]North, JBL (1963), 369.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of the material examined in this dissertation, the following conclusions can be drawn.

The Chronicler, who may have been Ezra, writing in the last half of the fifth century B.C. in the restored Judah, drew together widely disparate materials to present the history of the Kingdom of Judah from the point of view of the Davidic dynasty and the then-current cultic practices.

The Chronicler was a careful historian, conscientious, but selective in his use of source material. He apparently had access to extensive collections of official documents, the writings of the prophets, and materials from outlying towns as well as from Jerusalem. He cannot justly be accused of having wilfully distorted the Samuel/Kings accounts to substantiate his own theological perspective. Where there is enough evidence to provide a check, the Chronicler's story proves accurate even in obscure details. This pattern of general reliability on the part of the Chronicler is worthy of more attention in biblical studies.

The Chronicler makes several claims regarding the origin of the priesthood. (1) Priests and Levites, although clearly two distinct orders, have a common ancestry in Levi

the son of Jacob. Zadok, the Davidic high priest, was a member of the Aaronide line of the Levi clan.

(2) The Chronicler claims that the structure of the priesthood as he knew it was the work of David, based on the earlier revelation to Moses. According to the Chronicler, David was not the inventor of the Priest/Levite distinction, nor of the priesthood itself. The Mosaic era is acknowledged as the source of the whole structure--modified by David, carried out in the restoration, but originating in the earliest years of the national life in the wilderness wanderings. The Chronicler does not dwell on the details of this early experience, but treats the concept as if it were common knowledge to his readers.

(3) The role of the priests remained relatively constant throughout the Monarchy, although their influence fluctuated. The role of the Levites, on the other hand, changed drastically as the Tabernacle gave way to the Temple. The Chronicler attributes the reorganization of the priesthood to David, even though it was not completed until the reign of his son Solomon.

While it is impossible to find external data which would confirm all the details of the Chronicler's presentation, it has been demonstrated that there are parallels going back at least as early as the beginning of the second millennium B.C. of the kind of reorganization of the cultic practitioners that the Chronicler attributes to David.

(4) The Chronicler also claims that organization of the priests and Levites in the post-exilic era was according to the Davidic pattern. There is little evidence outside the Chronicler's own work to substantiate his position in detail; but the demonstrated reliability of the Chronicler is a warrant for taking his understanding of the priesthood seriously. The strong traditionalism of the ancient Near Eastern peoples in matters of cultus tends to lend credence to the view that any major alteration in the cult would be impossible apart from some fairly strong precedents. New situations demand new approaches. But the needs of the new situations cannot be met simply by inventing a new methodology and new traditions to authenticate it. The essentially conservative nature of the cultus forbids that sort of inventive operation.

The evidence seems to indicate that the Chronicler's claims for the origin of the priesthood are valid, and that more emphasis ought to be placed on the Chronicler's historical and theological reliability. A new awareness of the place of the Chronicler's work in the canon is also suggested. These books are not simply late compositions with no real historical value apart from recording the post-exilic religious situation. Rather they are important evidence of the use of pre-exilic roots in the post-exilic temple cultus, and of keen theological insight on the part of the Chronicler.

The Israelite commitment to the concept of an

historical covenant between herself and Yahweh was too deeply ingrained to allow willful dishonesty or unwarranted manipulation of the things she held most dear. The Chronicler, in attempting to meet the new needs of the post-exilic community, drew on the prior revelation; he supplemented it through careful research; he drew new conclusions. But these conclusions were always within the limits of the already established covenant structure. The liturgical tradition present in the Chronicler falls within that limit.

The final linking of Davidic messianism with the priestly temple cultus was an innovative theological insight of the Chronicler which has affected the theology and the liturgy of twenty-five centuries of Judaism and 2000 years of Christianity. The work of the Chronicler must not be relegated to some obscure theological backwater, but must take its place in the mainstream of the ongoing revelation of Yahweh's dealings with his people.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Abel, F. M. Geographie de la Palestine. Paris: Gabalda, 1933, 1938.

Albright, William Foxwell. Archeology and the Religion of Israel. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1942.

_____. From the Stone Age to Christianity. New York: Doubleday and Co., Anchor Books, 1957.

_____. History, Archeology and Christian Humanism. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

_____. Yahweh and the Gods of Canaan. The Jordan Lectures, 1965. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1968.

Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume. English section. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1950.

Alt, Albrecht. Kleine Schriften zur Geschichte des Volkes Israel. 3 vols. Munich: Beck, 1953-59.

Anderson, R. T. Attitudes of the pre-exilic Canonical Prophets towards the Cultus. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1957.

Avi-Yonah, M. & S. Yeivin. The Antiquities of Israel. I. N.p., Tel Aviv, 1955.

Barnes, W. E. The Books of the Chronicles. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1899.

Baudissin, Wolf Wilhelm Friedrich von. Die Geschichte des alttestamentlichen Priesterthums, Leipzig, 1889.

Bentzen, Aage. Die Josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen. N.p., Copenhagen, 1926.

_____. Studie uber dit Zadokidiske Praestekabs historie. 1931.

Benzinger, I. Die Bücher der Chronik (Kurzen Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament). Tübingen und Leipzig: Mohr, 1901.

Borne, A. van den. Kronieken (De Boeken von Het Oude Testament). Roermond en Maaseik: J. J. Romen and Zonen, 1960.

Bright, John. Early Israel in Recent History Writing. Vol. XIX in Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1956.

_____. A History of Israel. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1959.

_____. Jeremiah. Vol. XXI of the Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1965.

Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R., and Briggs, Charles A. (eds.). A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. (Corrected ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.

Browne, Laurence E. Early Judaism. Cambridge: University Press, 1929.

Cazelles, H. Les Livres des Chroniques (La Sainte Bible). Paris: Cerf, 1954.

Carr, Gordon Lloyd. "A Study in the Theology of Malachi." Unpublished Th.M. dissertation, Union Theological Seminary, Virginia, 1966.

Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

Childs, Brevard S. Memory and Tradition in Israel. Vol. XXXVII of Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, 1962.

Clements, R. Prophecy and Covenant. Vol. XL of Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1965.

Cody, Aelred. A History of Old Testament Priesthood. Analecta Biblica, Vol. XXXV. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969.

Cowley, A. Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1923.

Crockett, William Day. A Harmony of the Books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles: The Books of the Kings of Judah and Israel. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House, 1954.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran. Rev. ed. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1961.

Curtis, Edward Lewis, and Albert A. Madsen. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Books of the Chronicles. The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures. New York: Scribner's, 1910.

Curtiss, Samuel Ives, Jr. The Levitical Priests. Edinburgh: n.p., 1877.

Driver, S. R. Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament. International Theological Library. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1913.

Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. Translated from the sixth German edition by J. A. Baker. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1961, 1967.

Eissfeldt, Otto. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Translated from the third German edition by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: Harper and Row, 1965.

Elmslie, William Alexander Leslie. The Book of Chronicles. The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Cambridge: University Press, 1916.

Ehrlich, A. B. Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel. Vol. VII. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1914.

Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet. Tübingen: Mohr, 1950.

Freedman, David Noel and Greenfield, Jonas C. (eds.). New Directions in Biblical Archeology. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1969.

Galling, K. Die Bücher der Chronik, Esra, Nehemia. Das Alte Testament Deutsch. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1954.

Gardiner, Alan H. (ed.). The Wilbour Papyrus. Four vols. London: Oxford University Press, 1941-1952.

Gerhardsson, Birger. Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. Vol. XXII of Acta Seminarri Neotestamentici Upsaliensis. Trans. by Eric J. Sharpe. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1961.

_____. Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1964.

Goettsberger, Johann. Die Bücher der Chronik oder Paralipomenon. Vol. XII in Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1939.

Gordon, Cyrus H. The Common Background of Greek and Hebrew Civilizations. 2nd ed. Norton Library. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1965.

_____. Ugaritic Handbook. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1947.

_____. Ugaritic Manual. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1955.

_____. Ugaritic Textbook. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1965.

Graecus Codex Vaticanus. Tomus II. Romae: Congregationis de Propaganda Fide, 1870.

Gray, George Buchanan. Sacrifice in the Old Testament: Its Theory and Practice. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

_____. Studies in Hebrew Proper Names. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896.

Gray, John. The Krt Text in the Literature of Ras Shamra: A Social Myth of Ancient Canaan. Vol. II, Documenta et Monumenta Orientis Antiqui. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1st ed., 1955; 2nd ed., 1964.

_____. The Legacy of Canaan. Vol. V of Supplements to Vetus Testamentum. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1st ed., 1957; 2nd ed., 1965.

Gressmann, H. (ed.). Altorientalische Bilder zum Alten Testament. 2nd ed. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1927.

Haller, M. Chronik (Die Schriften des Alten Testaments, II, 3, pp. 330-54). 2nd ed. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1925.

Harrison, Roland Kenneth. Introduction to the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1969.

Harvey-Jellie, W. R. Chronicles. The New Century Bible. New York: Henry Frowde, 1906.

Hervey, (Lord) Arthur Charles. The Books of Chronicles in Relation to the Pentateuch and the "Higher Criticism." London: Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. New York: E. and J. B. Young and Co., 1892.

The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.

Hoonacker, A. van. Le sacerdoce lévitique dans la loi et dans l'histoire des Hébreux. Louvain: J. B. Istas, 1899.

Ignace Goldziher Memorial Volume. Budapest: n.p., 1948.

Jahn, G. Die Bücher Esra (A und B) und Nehemja textkritisch und historich-kritisch untersucht. Mit Erklärung der einschlägigen Prophetstellen und einem Ankang über hebräische Eigennamen. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1909.

_____. Die Elephantiner Papyri und die Bücher Esra-Nehemja. Mit einem Supplement zur Erklärung der hebräischen Eingennamen. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1913.

Jänssen, E. Juda in der Exilszeit. Vol. LXIX of Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testamentes. Gottingen, 1956.

Jocz, Jakob. The Covenant: A Theology of Human Destiny. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1968.

Johnson, Aubrey R. The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel. Cardiff: University of Wales, 1944.

Johnson, B. Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta. Vol. XXII of Studia Theologica Lundensia. Lund: n.p., 1963.

Johnson, Marshall D. The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogy of Jesus. Vol. VIII of Society for New Testament Studies, Monograph Series. General ed., Matthew Black. Cambridge: University Press, 1969.

Johnson, Philip C. Critical Problems in Deuteronomy. Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, Chicago, 1948.

Josephus, Flavius. The Works of Flavius Josephus. Trans. by William Whiston. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1890.

Junge, E. Die Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Riches Juda unter Josia. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1937.

Kapelrud, Arvid S. Baal in the Ras Shamra Texts. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1952.

_____. The Question of the Authorship in the Ezranarrative. A Lexical Investigation. Oslo: n.p., 1944.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. The Religion of Israel from its Beginnings to the Babylonian Exile. Trans. by Moshe Greenberg. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.

Kautzsch, E. and Cowley, A. E. Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar. 2nd ed. (corrected), 1960. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963.

Keil, Karl Friedrich. The Books of the Chronicles. Biblical Commentary on the Old Testament by C. F. Keil and F. Delitzsch. Trans. by Andrew Harper. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1950 (reprint).

Kenyon, Kathleen M. Archeology in the Holy Land. 3rd ed. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

_____. Jerusalem: Excavating 3000 Years of History. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

Kitchen, Kenneth A. Ancient Orient and Old Testament. London: Tyndale Press, 1966.

Kittel, Rudolf (ed.). Biblica Hebraica. 7th ed. (corrected). Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951.

_____. Die Bücher der Chronik und Esra, Nehemia und Esther. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament. Gottingen: Vanderhoeck and Ruprecht, 1902.

_____. Geschichte des Volkes Israel. 3 vols. Vols. I and II, Gotha: Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1923, 1925; Vol. III, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1927-29.

Klein, Ralph Walter. "Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

Koehler, Ludwig and Walter Baumgartner (eds.). Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros. Leiden: E. J. Brill. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., Vol. I, 1951; Vol. II, 1953.

Kraeling, E. G. H. (ed.). The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

_____. Rand McNally Bible Atlas. New York: Rand McNally Co., 1956.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. Worship in Israel: A Cultic History of the Old Testament. Trans. by Geoffrey Buswell. Richmond, Virginia: John Knox Press, 1966.

Kropat, A. Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1909.

Kugler, F. X. Von Moses bis Paulus. Munster: n.p., 1922.

Lemke, Werner Erick. "Studies in the History of the Chronicler." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1964.

Lindblom, Johannes. Prophecy in Ancient Israel. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1962.

Lods, Adolphe. The Prophets and the Rise of Judaism. Trans. by S. H. Hooke. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd., 1937.

Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume. English Section. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1945.

Luckenbill, D. D. (ed.). Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926-27.

Mandelkern, Solomon. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae Atque Chaldaicae. 6th ed. Tel-Aviv: Suptibus Schocken Hierosolymis, 1964.

Mazar, B. The Cities of the Priests and the Levites. Vol. VII of Supplements to Vetus Testamentum, 1960.

Mélanges syriens Offerts à M. René Dussaud. Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1939.

Meyer, E. Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Halle: Niemeyer, 1896.

_____. Geschichte des Altertums. 3rd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschftliche Buchgemeinschaft, 1953-58 (reprint).

_____. Kleine Schriften. 2nd ed. Halle: Niemeyer, 1924.

Michaeli, Frank. Les livres des Chroniques, d'Esdra et de Néhémie. Vol. XVI of Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1967.

Myers, Jacob M. I Chronicles. Vol. XII of The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1965.

_____. II Chronicles. Vol. XIII of The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1965.

_____. Ezra-Nehemiah. Vol. XIV of The Anchor Bible. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1965.

Nielsen, E. Shechem. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad, 1955.

Noordtzij, A. De Boerken der Kronieken (Korte Verklarung der Heilige Schift). Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1957.

Noth, Martin. Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft von Alten und Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928.

_____. The History of Israel. New York: Harper, 1958.

_____. Uberlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Niemeyer Verlag, 1957.

Palache, J. L. Semantic Notes on the Hebrew Lexicon. Trans. by R. J. Zui. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1959.

Pedersen, Johannes. Israel: Its Life and Culture. Four vols. in two. I and II, London: Oxford University Press, 1926; III and IV, London: Oxford University Press, 1940; and additions, 1959.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. Introduction to the Old Testament. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Bros., 1941.

Pritchard, J. B. (ed.). The Ancient Near East in Pictures Relating to the Old Testament. Princeton: University Press, 1954.

_____. (ed.). Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament. 2nd ed. Princeton: University Press, 1955.

Rad, Gerhard von. Das Geshichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes. Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1930.

_____. Old Testament Theology. 2 vols. Trans. from the 2nd German ed. by D. M. G. Stalker (1957). New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

_____. Studies in Deuteronomy. Vol. IX of Studies in Biblical Theology. Chicago: H. Regnery Co., 1953.

Rehm, M. Die Bücher der Chronik (Echter-Bibel). Wurzburg: Echter-Verlag, 1934.

_____. Textkirtische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik. (Alttestamentliche Abhandlung). Münster: Aschendorf, 1937.

Rendtorff, Rolf. Studien zur Geschichte des Opfers im Alten Israel. Vol. XXIV of Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament. N.p.: Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1967.

Rothstein, J. W., and J. Hänel. Kommentar zum ersten Buch der Chronik. Kommentar Zum Alten Testament. Leipzig: A. Diechert, 1927.

Rowley, H. H. (ed.). The Old Testament and Modern Study. Oxford: University Press, 1961.

_____. Worship in Ancient Israel: Its Form and Meaning. London: S.P.C.K., 1967.

_____. The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament. 1st ed. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952; 2nd ed, rev. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965.

Rudolph, W. Chronikbücher. Handbuch zum Alten Testament. Tübingen: Mohr, 1955.

Selms, A. van. I-II Kronieken (Teskst en Uitleg). Groningen-Batavia: J. B. Wolter, 1939, 1947.

Septuaginta. Alfred Rahlfs (ed.). Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.

Slotki, Judah J. Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah (Soncino Books of the Bible). London: The Soncino Press, 1951.

_____. Chronicles (Soncino Books of the Bible). London: The Soncino Press, 1952.

Society for Old Testament Study. The Old Testament and Modern Study. Ed. by H. H. Rowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951.

_____. Studies in Old Testament Prophecy. Ed. by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke, 1950

_____. Archeology and Old Testament Study. Ed. by D. Winton Thomas. Jubilee Volume of the Society for Old Testament Study, 1917-1967. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Sperber, Alexander. A Historical Grammar of Biblical Hebrew. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.

Swete, Henry Barclay. The Old Testament in Greek, According to the Septuagint. 3 vols. Cambridge: University Press, 1894.

Thiele, Edwin R. The Mysterious Numbers of the Hebrew Kings. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951, 1965.

Thoburn, Charles S. "Old Testament Sacrifice in the Light of Ugaritic Literature." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, Boston University, 1954.

Torrey, Charles C. The Chronicler's History of Israel. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954.

_____. The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah. Vol. II of Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1896.

_____. Ezra Studies. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910.

Vannutelli, P. Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti seu Librorum Regum et Chronicorum loci paralleli. Rome: Pontifico Instituto Biblico, 1931.

Vaux, Roland de. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Trans. by John McHugh. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1961.

_____. Les sacrifices de l'Ancien Testament. Vol. I of Cahiers de la Revue Biblique. Paris: n.p., 1964.

Vogt, Hubertus C. Studie zur nachexilischen Gemeinde in Esra-Nehemia. Rome: Dietrich, 1966.

Welch, Adam C. Post-Exilic Judaism. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood, 1935.

_____. The Work of the Chronicler. The Schweich Lectures, 1938. London: The British Academy, 1939.

Wellhausen, Julius. Der texte der Bücher Samuelis. Gottingen: Vandenhock and Ruprecht, 1871.

Wright, G. Ernest. Biblical Archaeology. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1962.

Wright, G. Ernest and Fuller, Reginald H. The Book of the Acts of God. Anchor Books. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1957.

Wright, J. Stafford. The Date of Ezra's Coming to Jerusalem. London: Tyndale Press, 1946.

Young, Edward J. An Introduction to the Old Testament. Rev. ed. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1960.

Zocker, Ott. Chronicles. Vol. VII, pp. 1-278 of Commentary on the Holy Scripture. Trans. by Philip Schaff. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1867; reprint, n.d.

Articles and Essays

Abba, R. "Priests and Levites," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible. Ed. by G. A. Buttrick. New York: Abingdon Press, 1962. III:228-33.

Adinolfi, M. "Le 'opere di pietà liturgica' di David in 2 Chron. 6:42," Biblia e Oriente, VIII (1966), 31-36.

Aharoni, Yohanan. "Arad: Its Inscriptions and Temple," The Biblical Archaeologist, XXXI (1968), 1-32.

_____. "Hebrew Ostraca from Tel Arad," Israel Exploration Journal, XVI (1966), 1-7.

_____. "Israelite Sanctuary at Arad," New Directions in Biblical Archaeology. New York: Doubleday, 1969.

_____. "The Negeb of Judah," Israel Exploration Journal, VIII (1958), 26-38.

_____. "The Negeb," Archaeology and Old Testament Study. Ed. by D. W. Thomas. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Ahlemann, F. "Zur Esra-Quelle," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LIX (1942/43), 77-98.

Ahlström, G. W. "Some Remarks on Prophets and Cult," Transitions in Biblical Scholarship. Ed. by J. Coert Rylaarsdam. Vol. VI of Essays in Divinity. General ed., Jerald C. Brauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 113-30.

Albright, W. F. "The Date and Personality of the Chronicler," Journal of Biblical Literature, XL (1921), 104-24.

_____. "The Biblical Period," The Jews: Their History, Culture and Religion. Ed. by L. Finkelstein. New York: Harper, 1949. I:3-69.

_____. "The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, C (1945), 16-22.

_____. "The Judicial Reform of Jehoshaphat," Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume. English section. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1950, pp. 61-82.

_____. "The List of Levitic Cities," Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, I, English Section, 1945, pp. 49-73.

_____. "Retrospect and Prospect in New Testament Archaeology," The Teachers Yoke: Studies in Memory of Henry Trantham. Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 1964, pp. 27-41.

_____. "The Old Testament and Canaanite Language and Literature," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, VII (1945), 5-31.

_____. "Samuel and the Beginnings of the Prophetic Movement," Interpreting the Prophetic Tradition. The Goldensen Lectures, 1955-1966. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1969, pp. 149-76.

_____. "Toward a More Conservative View," Christianity Today, VII (1962-63), 359-61.

_____. "A Votive Stele Erected by Ben Hadad I of Damascus to the God Melcarth," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, LXXXVII (1942), 23-29.

Allrik, H. L. "The Lists of Zerubbabel (Neh. 7-Ezra 2) and the Hebrew Numerical Notation," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXVI (1954), 21-27.

Auerbach, E. "Die Herkunft der Sadokiden," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft," XLIX (1931), 327-28.

Barnes, W. E. "The Religious Standpoint of the Chronicler," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XIII (1896), 14-20.

Bartlett, J. R. "Zadok and His Successors at Jerusalem," Journal of Theological Studies, N. S., XIX (1968), 1-18.

Baudissin, W. W. G. "Priests and Levites," Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, Edinburgh, 1902, IV, 67-97.

Bea, A. "Neure Arbeiten zum Problem der biblischen Chronikbucher," Biblica, XXII (1941), 46-58.

Bentzen, Aage. "Zur Geschichte der Sadokiden," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LI (1933), 173-76.

Beyer, G. "Das Festungssystem Rehabeams," Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins, LIV (1931), 113-34.

Blank, Sheldon H. "The Dissident Laity in Early Judaism," Hebrew Union College Annual, XIX (1945-46), 33-36.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "Kiriath-Jearim and the Ark," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVIII (1969), 143-56.

Boyd, James Oscar. "The Composition of the Book of Ezra," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, XI (1900), 261-97.

_____. "The Documents of the Book of Ezra," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, XI (1900), 414-37.

_____. "The Historicity of Ezra," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, XI (1900), 568-607.

Brunet, A. M. "Le Chroniste et ses sources," Revue Biblique, LX (1953), 481-508; LXI (1954), 349-86.

_____. "La théologie du Chroniste. Théocratie et messianisme," Sacra Pagina, I (1959), 384-97.

Budde, K. "Die Herkunft Sadok's," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LII (1934), 42-50.

Caquot, A. "Peut-on parler de messianisme dans l'oeuvre du Chroniste?" Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, XCIX (1966), 110-20.

Cohen, Martin A. "The Role of the Shilonite Priesthood in the United Monarchy of Ancient Israel," Hebrew Union College Annual, XXXVI (1965), 59-98.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. "The Discovery of the Samaria Papyri," The Biblical Archaeologist, XXVI (1963), 110-21.

_____. "A New Qumran Biblical Fragment Related to the Original Hebrew Underlying the Septuagint," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CXXXII (1953), 15-26.

_____. "The Oldest Manuscript from Qumran," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIV (1955), 147-72.

_____. "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dâliyeh," New Directions in Biblical Archaeology. New York: Doubleday and Co., 1969, pp. 41-62.

_____. "Qumran and the Biblical Text," Israel Exploration Journal, XVI (1966), 81-85.

_____. "The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert," Harvard Theological Review, LVII (1964), 281-99.

Culver, Robert D. "Peculiarities and Problems of Genealogical Method and of Text in the Book of Chronicles," Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society, V (1962), 35-41.

Ellison, H. L. "I and II Chronicles," New Bible Dictionary. Ed. by F. Davidson, A. M. Stibbs, and E. F. Kevin. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1953, pp. 210-12.

Elmslie, W. A. L. "The First and Second Books of Chronicles," The Interpreter's Bible. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954. III, 339-548.

Emerton, J. A. "Beth-Shemesh," Archeology and Old Testament Studies, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

_____. "Priests and Levites in Deuteronomy: An Examination of Dr. G. E. Wright's Theory," Vetus Testamentum, XII (1962), 129-38.

Francisco, Clyde T. "1-2 Chronicles," 1 Samuel-Nehemiah. The Broadman Bible Commentary. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman Press, 1970. III

Freedman, David Noel. "The Babylonian Chronicle," The Biblical Archaeologist, XIX (1956), 50-60.

_____. "The Chronicler's Purpose," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIII (1961), 436-42.

Galling, K. "The 'Gōlā-List' according to Ezra 2, Nehemiah 7," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXX (1951), 149-58.

Gelin, A. "Le Sacerdoce de l'Ancienne Alliance," La Tradition sacerdotale. N.p.: Le Puy, 1959, pp. 27-60.

Gemser, Berend. "Questions Concerning the Religion of the Patriarchs," Adhuc Loquitur. Ed. by A. van Selms. Volume VII of the Praetoria Oriental Series. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1968, 30-61.

Gowan, Donald E. "Prophets, Deuteronomy, and the Syncretistic Cult in Israel," Transitions in Biblical Scholarship. Ed. by J. Coert Rylaarsdam. Vol. VI of Essays in Divinity. General ed., Jerald C. Brauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 93-112.

Greenberg, Moshe. "A New Approach to the History of the Israelite Priesthood," Journal of the American Oriental Society, LXX (1950), 41-46.

Grelot, P. "Retour au Parwaim," Vetus Testamentum, XIV (1964), 155-63.

Grimme, H. "Der sudarabische Levitismus und sein, Verhaltnis zum Levitismus in Israel," Le Muséon, XXXVII (1924), 166-69.

Gunneweg, A. H. J. "Leviten und Priester. Hauptlinien der Traditionsbildung und Geschichte des israelitischen-jüdischen Kultpersonsls," Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des alten und neuen Testaments, LXXXIX (1965), 7-225.

_____. "Uber den Sitz im Leben der sog. Stammesspruche (Gen. 49; Dtn. 33; Jud . 5)," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LXXVI (1964), 245-55.

Haran, Menahem. "The Complex of Ritual Acts Inside the Tabernacle," Scripta Hierosolymitana, VIII (1961), 272-302.

Harris, Laird. "On a Possibly Revision of the Biblical Text During the Monarchy," Papers Read at the 1953 Meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society, Chicago, Illinois. (Printed, but not published.) Editorial Committee, c/o Burton L. Goddard, Box E, Beverly Farms, Mass., pp. 18-24.

Hauer, C. E., Jr. "Who was Zadok?" Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII (1963), 89-94.

Hauret, Ch. "Évolution du sacerdoce dans l'Ancien Testament," Assemblées du Seigneur, XCIII (1965), 45-66.

Hélewa, Jean. "Ministère doctrinal du prêtre dans la théologie ecclésiale du Prophète Osée," Ephemerides Carmeliticae, XVII (1966), 5-30.

Hempel, J. "Chronik," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, VII (N.F.) (1930), 187-206.

Horton, Stanley M. "Critical Note: A Suggestion Concerning the Chronology of Solomon's Reign," Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society, IV (1961), 3-4.

Huffmon, Herbert B. "Prophecy in the Mari Letters," Biblical Archaeologist, XXXI (1968), 101-24.

Jaubert, Annie. "Le calendrier des Jubilés," Vetus Testamentum, VII (1957), 35-61.

Japhet, Sara. "The Supposed Common Authorship of Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehemiah Investigated Anew," Vetus Testamentum, XVIII (1968), 330-71.

Johnson, Aubrey R. "The Prophet in Israelite Worship," Expository Times, XLVII (1935-36), 312-19.

Judge, H. G. "Aaron, Zadok, and Abiathar," Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. VII (1956), 70-74.

Kapelrud, A. S. "The Date of the Priestly Code," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute (IN Jerusalem), III, 1964.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel. "Early Israelite History in Canaan," Scripta Hierosolymitana, VIII (1961), 303-34.

_____. "Problem der israelitische-jüdischen Religionsgeschichte," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, XLVIII (N.F. 7) (1930), 23-43; LI (N.F. 10) (1933), 35-47.

Kennett, R. H. "The Origin of the Aaronite Priesthood," Journal of Theological Studies, VI (1905), 161-86.

Klein, S. "Kleine Beiträge zur Erklarung der Chronik," Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums, LXX (1926), 410-16; LXXX (1936), 195-206.

Kropart, A. "Die Syntax des Autors der Chronik," Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, XVI (1909).

Lapp, Paul. "Ptolemaic Stamped Handles from Judah," Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, CLXXII (1963), 22-35.

Lehming, Sigo. "Massa und Meriba," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LXXIII (1961), 71-77.

Lemke, W. E. "The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History," Harvard Theological Review, LVIII (1965), 349-63.

Leupold, Ulrich S. "Worship Music in Ancient Israel: Its Meaning and Purpose," Canadian Journal of Theology, XV (1969), 176-86.

Levine, Baruch A. "The Descriptive Tabernacle Texts of the Pentateuch," Journal of the American Oriental Society, LXXXV (1965), 307-18.

_____. "The Netînîm," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII (1963), 211-12.

Lindblom, Johannes. "Lot-casting in the Old Testament," Vetus Testamentum, XII (1962), 164-78.

Liver, J. "Korah, Dathan, and Abiram," Scripta Hierosolymitana, VIII (1961), 189-217.

Macmillan, Kerr D. "Concerning the Date of the Chronicles," Presbyterian and Reformed Review, XI (1900), 507-11.

Malamat, A. "Aspects of the Foreign Policies of David and Solomon," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XXII (1963), 9-17.

Mazar, B. "En-Gedi," Archeology and Old Testament Study. Ed. by D. W. Thomas. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

McEwan, C. W. "The Syrian Expedition of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago," American Journal of Archaeology, XLI (1937), 9-13.

Medico, H. E. del. "Zahab Parwayin, L'or fructifière dans la tradition juive," Vetus Testamentum, XIII (1963), 158-86.

Meek, T. J. "Aaron and the Sadocides," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XLV (1928/29), 149-66.

_____. "Moses and the Levites," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, LVI (1939), 113-20.

_____. "Some Religious Origins of the Hebrews," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XXXVII (1921), 101-31.

Mendelsohn, I. "Urim and Thummin," The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, IV, 739-40.

Merwe, B. J. van der. "A Few Remarks on the Religious Terminology in Amos and Hosea," Ou-Testamentiese Werkgemeenskap van Suid-Afrika (1964/65), 143-52.

Michaelis, Wilhelm. "ὁράω, εἶδον, βλέπω, ὀπτάνομαι, θεάομαι, θεωρέω." Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, V:315-67.

Miller, J. Maxwell. "Another Look at the Chronology of the Early Divided Monarchy," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVI (1967), 276-88.

_____. "The Elisha Cycle and the Accounts of the Omride Wars," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXV (1966), 441-54.

Minette de Tillesse, Georges. "Sections 'tu'et sections 'vous' dans le Deutéronome," Vetus Testamentum, XII (1962), 29-87.

Möhlenbrink, K: "Die levitischen Überlieferungen des Alten Testaments," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LII (1934), 184-231.

Morgenstern, J. "A Chapter in the History of the High Priesthood," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, LV (1938), 1-24, 183-97, 360-77.

Moriartry, Frederick L. "The Chronicler's Account of Hezekiah's Reform," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVIII (1965), 399-406.

Mowinckel, Sigmund. Norsk Geografisk Tidshrift, IX (1942), 1-32.

Muller, Max. W. "Sukkiims," Encyclopedia Biblica, IV, 4820-21.

Mullo-Weir, C. J. "Nuzi," Archeology and Old Testament Study. Ed. by D. W. Thomas. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967, pp. 73-86.

Myers, Jacob M. "The Kerygma of the Chronicler," Interpretation, XX (1966), 259-73.

Naveh, J. "A Hebrew Letter from the Seventh Century B.C.," Israel Exploration Journal, X (1960), 129-39.

Nielsen, Eduard. "The Levites in Ancient Israel," Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute, III (1964), 16.

Noordtzij, A. "Les intentions du Chroniste," Revue Biblique, XXI (1940), 161-68

North, F. S. "Aaron's Rise in Prestige," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LXVI (1954), 191-99.

North, Robert. "The Theology of the Chronicler," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXII (1963), 369-81.

_____. "The Cain Music," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXIII (1964), 373-89.

Noth, Martin. "Remarks on the Sixth Volume of Mari Texts," Journal of Semitic Studies, I (1956), 322-33.

Plastaras, James C. "Ritualist or Minister of the Word," Worship, XXXIX (1965), 400-11.

Porat, F. "Biblical Studies," Leshônênû, XXI (1957), 239-43.

Prussner, Frederick C. "The Covenant of David and the Problem of Unity in Old Testament Theology," Transitions in Biblical Scholarship. Ed. by J. Coert Rylaarsdam. Vol. VI of Essays in Divinity. General ed., Jerald C. Brauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 17-42.

Rad, Gerhard von. "Die levitische Predigt in den Buchern der Chronik," Festschrift Otto Procksch. Leipzig: A. Deichertsche Verlasbuchhandlung, 1934.

_____. "Die Nehemia-Denkschrift," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlich Wissenschaft, LXXVI (1964), 176-187.

Randellini, L. "Il libro delle Chronache nel decennio 1950-1960," Revista Biblica (Italiana), X (1962), 136-55.

Rawlingson, A. E. J. "Priesthood and Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity," Expository Times, LX (1949), 115-21.

Reed, W. L. "Gibeon," Archeology and Old Testament Study. Ed. by D. W. Thomas. Jubilee Volume of the Society for Old Testament Study, 1917-1967. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Rendtorff, Rolf. "נביא in the Old Testament," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, VI, pp. 796-812.

Richardson, H. N. "The Historical Reliability of Chronicles," Journal of Bible and Religion, XXVI (1958), 9-12.

Rowley, H. H. "The Chronological Order of Ezra and Nehemiah," The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament. 2nd ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965, pp. 137-67.

_____. "The Nature of the Old Testament Prophecy," The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the Old Testament. 1st ed. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952, 91-128.

_____. "Melchizedek and Zadok," Festschrift für Alfred Bertholet. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1950, 461ff.

_____. "The Prophet Jeremiah and Book of Deuteronomy," Studies in Old Testament Prophecy. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1950.

_____. "Sanballat and the Samaritan Temple," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, XXXVIII (1955), 166-98.

_____. "Zadok and Nehushtan," Journal of Biblical Literature, LVIII (1939), 113-41.

Rowlingson, A. E. J. "Priesthood and Sacrifice in Judaism and Christianity," Expository Times, LX (1949), 115-21.

Rudolph, Wilhelm. "Problems of the Books of Chronicles," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 401-09.

_____. "Zur Theologie des Chronisten," Theologische Literatur-Zeitung, LXXIX (1954), 285ff.

Scott, R. B. Y. "Priesthood, Prophecy, Wisdom, and the Knowledge of God," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXX (1961), 1-15.

Segal, M. H. "The Book of Deuteronomy," Jewish Quarterly Review, XLVIII (1958), 315-51.

_____. "The Composition of the Pentateuch," Scripta Hierosolymitana, VIII (1961), 68-114.

Seligmann, I. L. "A Psalm from pre-regal times (Dt. 33)," Vetus Testamentum, XIV (1964), 75-92.

Sellin, E. "Efod und Terafim," Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society, XIV (1934), 185ff.

Smith, W. R. and Bertholet, A. "Levites" and "Priests," Encyclopedia Biblica. Ed. by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, III (London, 1902), 2770-76 and 3837-47.

Sole, Francesco. "Levitismo," Palestra del Clero, XLV (1966), 1293-1306.

Speiser, E. A. "Unrecognized Dedication," Israel Exploration Journal, XIII (1963), 69-73.

Stigers, Harold G. "The Interphased Chronology of Jotham, Ahaz, Hezekiah, and Hoshea," Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society, IX (1966), 81-90.

Stinespring, W. F. "Eschatology in Chronicles," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXX (1961), 209-19.

Torrey, Charles C. "The Chronicler's History of the Return under Cyrus," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, XXXVII (1921), 81-100.

Tournay, R. "Le psaume et les bénédictions de Moise. Deut. 33," Revue Biblique, LXV (1958), 181-213.

Vande Walle, R. "An Administrative Body of Priests and a Consecrated People--Ex. 19:6," Indian Journal of Theology, XIV (1965), 57-72.

Vaux, Roland de. "Lévites minéens et lévites israélites," Lux tua Veritas (Festschrift Herbert Junker), Trier, 1961, pp. 265-73.

Vink, J. C. "The date and origin of the Priestly Code in the Old Testament," The Priestly Code and Seven Other Studies. Vol. XV of Oudtestamentische Studien, 1968.

Waterman, Leroy. "Jacob, the Forgotten Supplanter," American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, LV (1938), 25-43.

Williams, Walter G. "Tension and Harmony Between Classical Prophecy and Classical Law," Transitions in Biblical Scholarship. Ed. by J. Coert Rylaarsdam. Vol. VI of Essays in Divinity. General ed., Jerald C. Brauer. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968, pp. 71-92.

Winter, Paul. "Twenty-six Priestly Courses," Vetus Testamentum, VI (1956), 215-17.

Wood, Carelton. "The Religion of Canaan," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXXV (1916), 1-133, 163-279.

Wright, G. E. "The Levites in Deuteronomy," Vetus Testamentum, IV (1954), 325-30.

Yadin, Yigel. "Excavations at Hazor, 1957," Israel Exploration Journal, VIII (1958), 10-14.

Young, E. J. "Chronicles, First Book of," The Encyclopedia of Christianity, Vol. II, 450-55.

_____. "Chronicles, Second Book of," The Encyclopedia of Christianity, Vol. II, 455-60.

Zimmerman, F. "Chronicles as a Partially Translated Book," Jewish Quarterly Review, XLII (1951-1952), 265-82, 387-412.

VITA

Gordon Lloyd Carr was born January 6, 1930, in Toronto, Canada, the only child of William Gordon Carr and Olive Ruth Jecks. His primary education was at Swansea Public School and his secondary education at Humberside Collegiate Institute, both in Toronto. He attended Central Baptist Seminary in Toronto, graduating in 1953 with the degree Bachelor of Theology in the Pastor's course. He attended Gordon College, Wenham, Mass., from 1961 to 1964, with a double major in Bible/Greek, and Foreign Languages, and was one course short of a major in History. He received the Bachelor of Arts, magna cum laude, from Gordon in 1964. He majored in Biblical Studies at Gordon Divinity School, Wenham, Mass., receiving the Bachelor of Divinity degree, cum laude, in 1965. At Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Virginia, he majored in Old Testament, and received the degree Master of Theology in 1966.

In 1964-65, he served as special lecturer in French at Gordon College. In 1966 he was appointed lecturer in History at Gordon College, and as special lecturer on the Gordon College European Seminar, 1967. Since 1968 he has served as Assistant Professor of Biblical and Theological Studies at Gordon College.